

auditory areas there are in the human brain nor exactly what it is that the ear recognizes from speech.

When Dr. Tunturi and his staff begin to study the human brain, they will look first at the primary auditory center. Does it respond like the dog's to different frequencies at different locations? He assumes that the same basic structure exists as was found in laboratory animals.

Once he has run the "control checks" on the human brain, Dr. Tunturi will begin to look for meaning detectors—whatever it is that allows people to think.

The search will be involved. There are 10 billion neurones in the human central nervous system (CNS). Each neurone is either with or without a nerve impulse at a given point in time, like a lightbulb which is either on or off. These neurones are connected with another or several neurones by junctions known as synapses. At some junctions the impulse only has one choice of direction, one bulb to light up, at others it may follow one of many diverging paths.

The state of the CNS is the pattern of those neurones with an impulse and those without—like a switchboard pattern of lights off and on.

Imagine a very simple system, one with two neurones. With this number, there are four possible patterns the system can have: both neurones off, both on, first on and second off or vice versa.

The human nervous system with its 10 billion neurones has 10-followed-by-3,200,000,000-zeroes possible states. Working 24 hours a day and writing one zero per second, it would take over 100 years just to write this number.

Since the pattern changes each time the ear picks up a sound, and the number of possible states is so great, multivariate statistics (which allow consideration of many variables at one time) will be used to allow understanding of what occurs at complicated junctions, where cells classify words into categories.

In studying the human brain, the system for employing statistical analysis will be similar to that used for laboratory animals. Patients with epilepsy or temporal lobe tumors who enter the hospital for neurosurgery will be asked to participate in the experiment.

If the patient agrees, an hour or so before his operation 50 painless electrodes will be attached to his brain. Sounds will then be fed to him and his brain response transmitted over 11 telephone wires to the computer system in the Research Building. There the data will be monitored and stored on magnetic tape.

With human patients Dr. Tunturi will have an advantage—the patient can be asked to concentrate on the sound, can be asked what he hears, so that the physical response can be correlated with the subjective response of the patient. The patient can be asked to associate the sound or word with other things, perhaps bringing into play the complicated junctions or circuits at which Dr. Tunturi hopes to find out how humans abstract—in short, what makes humans human.

It's a rather Herculean task, yet the ability to understand language (which presupposes the ability to abstract, by definition) has greatly influenced the destiny of the human race, as metallurgists are only now beginning to explore.

Only man has the ability, so far as we know, to take sounds and make of them meaning. The word itself is not the meaning—that is basic to ideas about language. The American tourist who indignantly asks why the French insist on calling bread *pain* when any fool can see it's bread just as it was at home, confuses the word with the meaning. There is no necessary connection.

But human beings have formed such con-

nections. Using the same basic sounds (phonemes) in all languages, but using them differently, all peoples have come up with systems of abstraction we call language.

A \$3 million computer will do the work of physical speech recognition that the three by three by 1/4 inch speech and hearing center of the human brain can do. It cannot, however, recognize meaning.

Any computer manufacturer, obviously, would see his stock skyrocket if he knew how to duplicate the working of the human brain. The Navy would like to know how the brain works. Then its scientists could learn how to improve its sonar and underwater communications systems to mesh with the workings of the humans who use them.

But most importantly, doctors would welcome the knowledge of how to improve their treatment of patients with disorders of the nervous system or brain.

Research such as that conducted by Dr. Tunturi has already made a difference in medical diagnosis and treatment, for example, in hearing testing. A steady tone, it has been observed, is not a test of cortical (brain) functioning. Complicated systems have been worked out which apparently do test the cortex.

But we need to know more both about the brain and language itself. At Georgia Institute of Technology they have found that the loss of a tiny section of speech can often obliterate a consonant from a test syllable or cause it to sound like a different speech element altogether. What if a person's cortex did not respond to one or several of these recognition clues in consonants? Since 90 percent of the knowledge in a language is carried by the consonants, how much meaning might that person miss while still able to hear?

When research like Dr. Tunturi's is completed and we hopefully will know how the brain works, then we can better use the capabilities of human beings, allowing those with brain and nervous disorders to live fuller lives.

The possibilities sound like science fiction. What question would you ask a robot whose brain was modeled after yours to test whether or not he were human?

We know of no such question.

But if such a robot is built, he will affect each of our lives. For the questions being asked in this research may well affect thinking in all fields—sciences and humanities. Such research may well raise moral questions as it provides scientific answers; it may change our total outlook, for its probes to the core—what makes humans human?

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 9, 1967, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 6, 1967:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

L. Dean Brown, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of

the United States of America to the Gambia, vice William R. Rivkin, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 6, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Alfred B. Pitt, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Price Daniel, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, FG398325, Air National Guard, to be reappointed as Chief, National Guard Bureau, for a period of four years beginning September 1, 1967, under the provisions of section 3015, title 10, of the United States Code.

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Noel A. M. Gayler, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning William B. Duty, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending John R. Younger, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 28, 1967.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Frank M. Adams, to be captain, and ending Martin "M" Zenni, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 27, 1967.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Roy J. Casteel, to be second lieutenant, and ending George W. Dilley, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 18, 1967; and

The nominations beginning William C. Airheart, to be colonel, and ending Sidney S. Wade, Jr., to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 18, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is my strength and my song, and He has become my salvation; this is my God, and I will praise Him, my Father's God and I will exalt Him.—Exodus 15: 2.

Almighty and eternal God, before whom a thousand years pass as a watch in the night, rekindle within us Thy spirit and replenish us with Thy grace as we face the tasks of another week. Be Thou a pillar of fire to us by night and a pillar of cloud by day. Lead us into green pastures, beside still waters, along right paths, that our spirits may be restored, that we may find comfort in hours of need, and that goodness and mercy may follow us all the days of our lives.

In these trying times help us to rise

above that which is mean and small and enable us to work together in glad good will for the honor and security of our Nation, for the good of our people and for the welfare of all mankind. In Thy most holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 5, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11456. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12474. An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11456) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12474) entitled "An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 985. An act for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2388. An act to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 11456, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BOLAND, McFALL, YATES, MAHON, MINSHALL, JONAS, and Bow.

WAR DISSENT MUST BE RESPONSIBLE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I respect dissent but on one condition; namely, that that dissent be responsible. The con-dign criticism of President Johnson on his Vietnam policy is irresponsible and therefore reprehensible. Shocking are the epithets hurled at him. A solon charged that our policy was "bankrupt" and the President was "brainwashed" by the Pentagon. A professor at the University of Colorado said that we are in Vietnam just to kill Americans.

Now, dissent should not be in disregard of our devotion to our country and our duty to our soldiers in the battlefield, but such bitter and abusive harangue bolsters the morale of our foe and prolongs the war.

I applaud the courage of the President for refusing to take the easy way out. He deplores the sacrifices, as we all do, that must be made. He also realizes that you cannot make war with rose water. We must harken unto the statements he made Saturday night when he said:

So we have a choice. We can take the easy road now, denying our responsibilities, hoping that a rise in our polls will compensate for what we ought to have done for our country, or we can take the harder road of responsibility. We can do what we believe is right for our children's future, though it may mean present pain.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12474, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY,

GIAIMO, MARSH, PRYOR, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, WYMAN, TALCOTT, and Bow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the rollcall vote on the conference report on the military construction bill, which was acted on by the House on October 3. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

LEIF ERIKSON DAY, OCTOBER 9, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, only the important business of this House of Representatives prevents me today from standing at the base of the statue of Leif Erikson, overlooking Shilshole breakwater in the Ballard area of Seattle.

However, I am mindful that this day is set aside annually to honor this man and all Scandinavians who have made so many great contributions to the life of our Nation.

As one of the original sponsors of the legislation which authorizes the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, I again proudly recognize the magnificent achievements of Leif Erikson.

Mr. Speaker, the saga of Leif Erikson's pioneering exploration of the link between Europe and the land we know as America, is a picture of bravery and intelligence.

And, today, as sturdy American citizens, the hard-working Scandinavian descendants of Leif Erikson stand to honor him.

Mr. Speaker, in spirit I join my constituents of Seattle and throughout the United States in paying tribute to Leif Erikson for whom this day has been proclaimed by the President for the flying of the American flag and for inviting the people of the United States to observe the annual commemoration with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

PROVIDING FOR THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS TO THE UPPER AND LOWER CHEHALIS TRIBES OF INDIANS, WASHINGTON—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.
The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 735)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the first sentence of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Sums payable to enrollees or to their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior with use limited to emergency medical care and direct educational expenses, until such minor becomes of age or disability ceases."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES A. HALEY,

ED EDMONDSON,

ROY A. TAYLOR,

E. Y. BERRY,

GEORGE HANSEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,

GEORGE MCGOVERN,

PAUL FANNIN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (H.R. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

H.R. 678, as passed by the House, provided in section 3 that sums payable to minor enrollees, their heirs or legatees, or enrollees suffering a legal disability shall be held in trust by the superintendent, Western Washington Agency, until such minor becomes of age or the disability ceases.

The Senate amended the bill to provide that payments to minor enrollees, their heirs or legatees, or enrollees under a legal disability, shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior, to be expended for the sole benefit of the beneficiary until he becomes of age or the disability ceases.

The effect of the House amendment is to prohibit the expenditure of such funds on behalf of a minor enrollee or those under legal disability until such minor becomes 21 years of age or the disability ceases. On the other hand, the effect of the Senate amendment is to permit the expenditure of such funds for the sole benefit of the beneficiary until he becomes of age or the disability ceases.

The amendment agreed upon by the conferees clearly sets forth the intent of both the House and the Senate to permit the expenditure of sums payable to minor enrollees, their heirs or legatees, and those under legal disability, but limits such expenditures to emergency medical care and direct educational expenses, until such minor becomes of age or the disability ceases. The language of the amendment adopted by the conferees prevents the expenditure of such funds ex-

cept for the purposes enumerated and protects the beneficiaries from those individuals who could otherwise obtain such funds on behalf of the beneficiaries and apply the same to their own purposes.

JAMES A. HALEY,

ED EDMONDSON,

ROY A. TAYLOR,

E. Y. BERRY,

GEORGE V. HANSEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I assume the amendments that were adopted in conference were all germane to this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. All the amendments are germane to the bill, and they were agreed upon unanimously by the conferees.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the conferees of this conference report before us today. I would particularly like to commend the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was kind enough to take the time and effort to provide the leadership in taking steps toward solving a problem which has become increasingly troubling.

When these claims are settled, I am sure there is the hope in everyone of us that the money will be used in the most useful manner possible, and particularly in the instance of children and young people in making provision for their education and needed emergency medical attention. Too often in the past money has been carelessly used and the young people find themselves desiring an education with no money available.

This conference report today is a major step toward helping the Indian young people of our Nation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the

following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 298]

Abbott	Gallagher	Quillen
Adair	Gardner	Rallsback
Adams	Goodell	Rarick
Addabbo	Green, Oreg.	Reinecke
Anderson, Ill.	Green, Pa.	Resnick
Ashley	Hagan	Riegle
Barrett	Halpern	Rivers
Blatnik	Hansen, Idaho	Ronan
Bow	Hansen, Wash.	Sandman
Brock	Ichord	St Germain
Broomfield	Jonas	St. Onge
Burton, Utah	Jones, Ala.	Scheuer
Button	Kelly	Sikes
Carey	King, N.Y.	Sisk
Casey	Kupferman	Smith, Iowa
Cederberg	Kyl	Smith, N.Y.
Cleveland	Laird	Springer
Conyers	Landrum	Stephens
Corbett	Leggett	Taylor
Culver	Long, La.	Tenzer
Curtis	Lukens	Tiernan
Daniels	McDonald,	Tuck
Dent	Mich.	Ullman
Derwinski	Martin	Utt
Diggs	Mathias, Md.	Vander Jagt
Downing	Michel	Vigorito
Dulski	Moorhead	Wampler
Edmondson	Morse, Mass.	Watkins
Evans, Colo.	Morton	Watts
Everett	Multer	Whalley
Farbstein	Nix	Williams, Miss.
Fino	O'Hara, Mich.	Willis
Ford, Gerald R.	O'Konski	Wilson, Bob
Fountain	Olsen	Wilson,
Fulton, Tenn.	Ottlinger	Charles H.
Galifianakis	Pirnie	Wolf

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 324 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL BY MIDNIGHT TO-NIGHT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION TO MEET DURING THE SESSION OF THE HOUSE TODAY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I said before upon one occasion that I would like to be present when this elections bill is considered by the Committee on House Administration. However, I am one of the House conferees of the conference committee on the foreign aid authorization bill, and the conferees on that bill are scheduled

to meet this afternoon, in an effort toward reaching agreement. I would like to see this conference report cleared so that we could then get to the consideration of the appropriation bill providing funds for the foreign aid program. With that out of the way perhaps we can adjourn sine die at some reasonable time.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BURLERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that should the House adjourn this afternoon by 4 o'clock, the Committee on House Administration will meet on the clean elections bill.

HOWARD J. SAMUELS, OF NEW YORK, AN OUTSTANDING NOMINATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the President on his recent nomination of Howard J. Samuels, of Canandaigua, N.Y., to the position of Under Secretary of the Department of Commerce. Mr. Samuels is a constituent of mine, and I know the Nation will be well served when his enormous talents and energy are directed at the challenges of service within the administration. Mr. Samuels is a success story in himself. In fact, his success story is also the story of this country. His college thesis at MIT became the basis for a multimillion-dollar corporation in the field of plastic packaging.

He also served with distinction on the battlefield during World War II, rising to the rank of lieutenant colonel at the age of 25. He has given unstintingly of himself to public and private organizations, with interests covering good government, education, employment, group relations, public health, philanthropy, and economic development. Mr. Samuels brings a freshness and vitality to Washington that we can readily put to good use, and I know he will be a great under secretary.

NATAL SALUTE TO UGANDA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the Government of Uganda celebrates its fifth birthday. It is interesting to note that a hundred years before its independence date, the territory that is now Uganda was first penetrated by explorers searching for the source of the Nile River.

The United States enjoys friendly relations with Uganda and is encouraging the government in a program to increase agricultural production and to make use of the limited mineral resources of the country.

The United States expects to see Uganda continue as a strong, self-assured, and independent nation, with democratic institutions which will fit local and national requirements.

Just last week I had the pleasure of meeting with the Foreign Minister of Uganda, His Excellency Sam N. Odaka. Our discussion in depth covered many subjects, including the economic and political situation of his country as well as the outlook for Africa as a whole. He left me with a continued feeling of optimism and confidence in Africa's future.

The Organization of African Unity, of which his country is a strong supporter, is a dominant force for the political and economic development of Africa.

To President A. Milton Obote and to the Ugandan Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency E. Otema Allimadi, I extend the best wishes of the people of the United States, from my colleagues in the Congress, and my own personal good wishes for the success and prosperity of Uganda in the future.

BOMBING PAUSE IN NORTH VIETNAM WOULD RELEASE 500,000 MORE COMMUNIST TROOPS TO WAGE WAR AGAINST AMERICAN TROOPS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I speak to my colleagues in the House of Representatives here in Washington, a young marine is being buried in Chicago, a victim of the war in Vietnam. He was shot and killed in Vietnam. This young man was Pfc. Gregory Kasper, who was killed in action on September 25 at Quang Tri. The flag flies over the Capitol in his honor today.

Mr. Speaker, I talked with his father yesterday. His father is a Chicago fireman. Both the father and mother told me of their tremendous loss. But they also told me of their pride in the fact that their son had participated voluntarily in defending the freedom of his country.

This Nation owes Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Kasper an eternal debt of gratitude for the sacrifice their son and they have made for our Nation's survival.

Mr. Speaker, as to those who have been

advising the President of the United States to pull out of Vietnam, I wish they had an opportunity to talk to these patriotic albeit grief-stricken parents. It is beyond the capacity of anyone to describe fully their grief and the extent of their personal loss. But these two wonderful Americans and all of those in Edison Park who mourned the loss of Private First Class Kasper are a source of strength in their deep understanding of how high the stakes are in Vietnam for the survival of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I saw in this morning's paper while flying to Washington an article to the effect that Life magazine was going to reverse its position in supporting the war and will urge the President to order a pause in our bombings of North Vietnam in the hope that such a pause will bring about negotiations for peace.

Mr. Speaker, at one time I also thought that we might consider a conditional pause until I had all the facts. I urged last May that we consider such a pause if the Communists would agree not to infiltrate South Vietnam. I said at the time that if they refuse to negotiate, then we should use all of our resources to force them to the negotiating table. It became quickly apparent, however, that the Communist are determined to resist all efforts at negotiations and our Nation has no choice but to pursue the war with whatever steps are necessary to a successful conclusion.

I hope that all of those who are urging a bombing pause, sincere as they are, will consider the fact that a bombing pause in North Vietnam would release 500,000 more Communists to wage war against our soldiers. We are tying up one-half million Communist soldiers in North Vietnam with our present bombing policy. The fact is that 175,000 Communist soldiers are tied up in the operation of antiaircraft batteries in anticipation of our aerial raids in North Vietnam.

Another 300,000 are tied up in cleaning up the damage that our airplanes and our bombers are causing in North Vietnam. Let there be no mistake. These incessant American bombings by our American bombers in North Vietnam are keeping Hanoi's best troops pinned down in the homeland. If the bombings should be stopped with no guarantee from the Communists that large troop transfers will not occur to South Vietnam, our casualties in Vietnam will mount measurably.

It is ironic that with our most recent successes in North Vietnam and at a time when our soldiers and our military people can see the hope of victory over communism in Vietnam, the crescendo is growing in this country for us to stop the bombings; pull back, and even abandon our mission. I believe that we Americans ought to unite behind our President and let him use all the resources at our command to get this war over with and be victorious as soon as possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I pause here today to pay homage to a young marine named Gregory Kasper, who gave his life for his country, and I hope that those who are urging that we quit now when there is a chance for victory in Vietnam will reconsider.

President Johnson has said repeatedly he is willing to halt the bombing if the Communists will agree to freeze their positions and not infiltrate South Vietnam during such a pause. The Communists refuse to make such a pledge.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the figures I have cited above—based on a reliable estimate from the highest sources in our Government—that a bombing pause in North Vietnam would release 500,000 Communist troops against our soldiers in South Vietnam, I believe the President is most wise in pursuing his present policy. He has no choice but to continue until such time as the Communists are prepared to assure us that a pause in our bombing will not be a green light for them to move their forces into South Vietnam for a massive attack against our troops.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

AMEND THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11395) to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 authorizing the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960, and ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11395

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 204(c) of the Act of July 14, 1960 (40 U.S.C. 664(c); 74 Stat. 540), section 3(b) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. 681; 79 Stat. 664) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (b) The work authorized by this section shall be subject to the provisions of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules contained in the aforesaid report, as modified in the report of the Agency entitled 'Revised Transit Development Program for the Nation's Capital, 1967', and shall be subject to the following:"

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the portion of section 3(b) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. 682) which precedes paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The work authorized by this section shall be subject to the provisions of the Na-

tional Capital Transportation Act of 1960, shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules contained in the aforesaid report, as modified in the report of the Agency entitled 'Revised Transit Development Program for the Nation's Capital, 1967', and shall be subject to the following:"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11395 is to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965—79 Stat. 663—which authorized the National Capital Transportation Agency to provide for the establishment of the system of rail rapid transit lines and related facilities described in the agency's report entitled "Rail Rapid Transit for the Nation's Capital, January 1965."

H.R. 11395 would modify that system in two material respects: First, by adding a line to serve the new and rapidly growing concentration of Federal employment in Southwest Washington, and second, by deleting the presently authorized spur line to Columbia Heights which branches off the Connecticut Avenue route.

BACKGROUND

The National Capital Transportation Agency—hereinafter referred to as "NCTA"—was established by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960—74 Stat. 537—which requires, in section 204(a), that the Agency shall prepare and may from time to time revise a transit development program for the transportation of persons within the National Capital region. Section 204(c) of the 1960 act provides that no part of the program may be carried out until expressly authorized by the Congress.

Pursuant to recommendations contained in the NCTA report of January 1965, entitled "Rail Rapid Transit for the Nation's Capital," Congress in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965—79 Stat. 663—authorized the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, consisting of a basic 25-mile system of rail rapid transit lines, stations, and related facilities.

Since the present program was approved on September 8, 1965, the Agency has moved forward with the general engineering and architectural work on the authorized system: Its activities have included a continuing evaluation of the system in terms of its ability to distribute passengers where they want to go downtown, its operating efficiency, and its revenue potential.

Congress has each year appropriated funds to the NCTA for its operations, including funds to permit the start of engineering and other work preliminary to actual construction.

Contracts have been negotiated with general engineering consultants and with architects to press ahead with the work to be done before detailed design and actual construction could be undertaken. A contract has been negotiated for a comprehensive program of soils testing to obtain information about subsurface conditions essential to subway design.

NCTA recently announced it had completed, in a span of only 18 months, the aerial mapping, the base line control surveys, and the general plans—with the definitive calculated alignments and profiles—for those routes scheduled for early construction. In addition, directive drawings, design criteria, and standard construction specifications are complete.

Also it announced its soils consultant had completed the current drilling program with respect to all elements of the system not involved in the proposed changes, and that subsurface conditions in Washington are not as unfavorable as rumor and speculation might indicate. With 440 test holes drilled, and with a test pit deep beneath Lafayette Park, NCTA has found acceptable water conditions, generally an alluvial soil, and in some part of the city excellent rock which will be of advantage during construction.

MODIFICATIONS HEREIN ARE BASED ON NEW TRAFFIC STUDIES

The modification provided in H.R. 11395 are the result of further traffic studies and surveys directed by Congress to be made by NCTA.

In the course of reviewing NCTA's request for funds for 1966, the chairman and members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies expressed concern whether or not certain traffic or patronage estimates of the Agency were sufficiently current or had been established by adequately sophisticated techniques. The Administrator was directed to arrange for an independent, professional study of probable patronage.

Pursuant thereto, the NCTA employed a consulting firm whom the NCTA Contractor Evaluation Board believed to be the most qualified and experienced organization for this particular study requiring knowledge of the highway and transit planning, traffic estimation, traffic engineering, and city planning.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS OF AUTHORIZED SYSTEM

FINDING I. GROWTH IN SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON

The study for the NCTA showed that downtown traffic congestion in Washington would not be alleviated by the authorized system to the extent that the Agency had expected. The Federal employment center in Southwest Washington proved to be a source of really tremendous patronage. The study found that large numbers would ride the rail system to G Street and then transfer to buses to complete their travel to the southwest. During the peak hour, at the 12th and G Street station, 70 buses would be required, and at Eighth and G Street 50 buses would be needed, to handle transfer traffic. Obviously, this would make traffic conditions worse than better. And fare splits with the bus company would be greater than had been anticipated, thus reducing rail transit revenues.

Since the present basic rapid rail transit system was approved, Southwest Washington between Capitol Hill and 12th Street SW., has been experiencing a dramatic change. With the new public building program now underway and the Federal departments and agencies al-

ready located there—the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Transportation, NASA, and others—this is fast becoming the major center of Federal employment in the District of Columbia.

This has been brought about by the extensive building program in Southwest Washington—a program that includes both Government buildings and private development which will include office buildings, stores, and a new hotel.

In the Government center alone employment is expected to approach a population figure nearly as great as in all of downtown Baltimore. The new Forrestal Building, which will be a sort of downtown Pentagon; the huge new headquarters of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and the extensive population explosion brought about by the establishment of the Department of Transportation whose employees spill over into a half dozen new office buildings in Southwest; NASA, HEW, USA—these are the major Government establishments in the area, but in point of numbers they represent just a few of the Government agencies which will eventually be housed in this new exploding population center.

EMPLOYMENT IN SOUTH MALL AREA

The startling present and projected employment figures for the Southwest area, which were not predicted when the basic system was approved, show the impact on transportation there.

SOUTH MALL EMPLOYMENT

	Existing (1967)	Projected (1980)
Federal		
Agriculture.....	9,700	11,000
Housing and Urban Development.....	5,600	17,000
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	8,500	6,400
Department of Defense.....	9,000	3,800
Department of Transportation.....	4,200	1,000
Treasury.....	900	2,400
Smithsonian Institute.....	7,800	12,300
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....		
Miscellaneous and other.....		
Total.....	33,500	68,500
Private.....	1,200	18,800
Total.....	35,000	87,000

Prior to the 1965 act, NSTA's planning for the basic system was predicated on employment estimates of the National Capital Planning Commission that in 1980 there would be 46,000 jobs located in the Southwest area. Since then, the forecast has changed radically. By 1971 an estimated 85,000 workers will be traveling to and from their employment in Southwest. The area's downtown daytime population will exceed the downtown populations in cities such as Seattle, Pittsburgh, and Baltimore.

Street traffic congestion is already severe in Southwest Washington, especially during rush hours. Much of the parking area that was available when the present basic system was authorized has disappeared. Street congestion is expected to be such a problem that in one report by traffic consultants the General Services Administration has been advised to delay a part of its public building program in Southwest until the subway

rapid transit service is in operation within the area. The Advisory Committee on Federal Buildings in the National Capital Region has unanimously endorsed the recommended Southwest alignment, and urges its construction as part of the basic system at the earliest possible date.

MODIFICATION NO. 1

Accordingly, the National Capital Transportation Agency recommended to the Congress that the approved basic rapid rail transit system be revised to include service to the area south of the Mall in Southwest Washington between Capitol Hill and 12th Street SW., as follows: by continuing the presently authorized Benning route in subway, from Pennsylvania Avenue and D Street SE., west beneath D Street to the vicinity of 12th Street SW., thence north along 12th Street to the vicinity of I Street NW., thence west along I Street NW., to a point where the line would connect with and become part of the already authorized Pentagon route. The new alignment would include stations in the vicinity of the Capitol, Fourth and D Streets SW., Seventh and D Streets SW., 12th Street

and Independence Avenue SW., at the Federal Triangle along 12th Street NW., and at 15th and I Streets NW.

FINDING II. DELETION OF COLUMBIA HEIGHTS SPUR

The other significant finding of the NCTA recent traffic study raised serious questions concerning the economic justification for the presently authorized Columbia Heights route. The data collected show it to be the weakest in the system, producing only an estimated 3,100 passengers in its peak hour, instead of 6,700 originally forecast there.

Further, this 3,100 peak-hour ridership estimate for Columbia Heights is far less than the projections for the other routes, as, for example, 6,900 for the Connecticut Avenue line, 17,100 on the Benning line, and 19,000 on the B. & O. Silver Spring line.

This disparity between the Columbia Heights spur and the other routes is even more marked in the 24-hour estimates as shown in the following table submitted by the NCTA for the committee, based on the traffic studies and estimates referred to.

TABLE 12-A.—ESTIMATED 1980 TOTAL, 24-HOUR MAXIMUM LOAD POINTS AND VOLUMES, AUTHORIZED SYSTEM

Route	Location	Peak hour volume			Total 24-hour volume ¹
		In-bound	Out-bound	Total	
Downtown subway.....	Between Judiciary Sq. and 8th and G.....	31,900	6,500	38,400	225,000
B. & O. Silver Spring.....	Between Union Station and Judiciary Sq.....	19,000	3,200	22,200	126,300
Connecticut.....	Between Calvert and Florida.....	6,900	2,600	9,500	66,000
Columbia Heights.....	Between Belmont and Florida.....	3,100	700	3,900	25,700
Connecticut and Columbia Heights.....	Between Connecticut and 12th and G and K.....	9,100	8,700	17,800	109,800
Benning.....	Between Capitol and Judiciary Sq.....	17,100	4,800	21,800	128,200
Pentagon.....	Between 18th and H and 12th and G.....	8,400	10,500	18,900	113,800

¹ Inbound plus outbound.

Note: Figures may not total due to rounding.

This volume of 3,100 peak-hour passengers from Columbia Heights does not, states the NCTA, justify rail rapid transit for that area and does not justify the estimated Columbia Heights line construction cost of \$56.5 million, the NCTA concluded.

These NCTA studies show that trains from Columbia Heights would carry very few passengers as compared with trains from Connecticut Avenue, Benning, Silver Spring, or from Virginia, and that actually many of the trains from Columbia Heights would be operating almost empty as compared with loaded trains from these other points.

The NCTA, in testimony before your committee, questioned whether a \$56 million feeder subway—the Columbia Heights spur—should be built to do the job of feeder bus routes, and pointed to the large percent of riders using cross-town buses to get to the Columbia Heights line. With the deletion of the Columbia Heights spur, these riders could continue on the buses to the Connecticut Avenue line and get the benefit there of more frequent service which that line generates.

The NCTA further testifies that there is another reason why the Columbia Heights spur should not be built, and that is that the needs of north-central Washington, including the Shaw urban renewal area, would be better and more efficiently served by the construction of

an independent route in either the Seventh or 14th Street traffic corridor as part of an expanded regional rail system now being studied by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The building of the Columbia Heights line would foreclose this more desirable route.

This further survey would appear to offer a more reasonable solution to the overall requirements insofar as the Columbia Heights area is concerned and one which the Congress, in due course, can consider in lieu of now retaining in the presently authorized system any portion which the Congress has been advised is not economically justified.

MODIFICATION NO. 2

In light of the foregoing, the National Capital Transportation Agency recommended to the Congress that the Columbia Heights route be deleted from the approved basic rapid rail transit system, the area in question to be served by cross-town and other feeder bus routes connecting to the Connecticut Avenue and other lines. At the same time, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority—regional organization successor to the NCTA—has underway studies of an independent route to serve the needs of this north-central Washington area.

FINANCING THE MODIFICATIONS

According to testimony presented to your committee, the NCTA studies show

that, in 1980, the system as modified by H.R. 11395, will attract an estimated 12,000 more riders than the authorized system during the peak hour, about 70,000 more riders daily, and some 22,300,000 riders annually. The 1980 forecasts also show that the modified system will carry a total of 153,800,000 riders, whereas the authorized system would carry only 131,500,000 riders in that year. This increase actually becomes apparent as early as 1974 when the full system goes into operation. In that year 131,700,000 riders would be attracted to the modified system, compared to 113,000,000 on the authorized system. During the final 3 years, 1971 to 1973, when only segments of the system are operable, the difference is relatively insignificant.

Operating costs are not expected to be significantly different in the modified system from those for the authorized system, the NCTA testified. It expects that in 1980 the increased patronage on the modified system, as compared with the new traffic figures for the authorized system, would produce additional net annual revenue—after operating costs and payment for feeder buses—of approximately \$3.5 million. Applied to bond debt service expense and assuming an interest rate of 5½ percent per annum, such added annual revenue would be sufficient to fund \$55 million of added capital costs over a 40-year period.

This amount of additional revenue would more than cover the new increase in capital costs which would result from the recommended modifications, the NCTA testified. Its estimates indicate that the provision of service to Southwest Washington, as proposed and as outlined above, would increase the cost of the basic system at current prices by \$98 million.

However, this would be reduced by \$56.5 million—the cost of the deleted Columbia Heights spur—making the net increase of the system, in capital cost, to be \$41.5 million, which NCTA officials testified can be financed from the additional revenues generated by the modified system, as indicated.

The total estimated capital cost of constructing the system originally authorized by Congress in 1965 was \$431 million, exclusive of interest requirements, financed as follows:

Source of funds	Million
Federal contribution.....	\$100
District of Columbia contribution.....	50
Public sale of revenue bonds.....	281
	431
Estimated additional cost of modified system	41.5
Total cost (exclusive of escalation)	472.5

ENDORSEMENT OF PROPOSED REVISIONS

Even before this proposed legislation was submitted to the Congress for introduction and consideration, the revised program had been studied and approved by 21 governing, regulatory, and planning bodies and other organizations concerned—practically all the agencies affected.

This action was taken as required by section 204(d) of the National Capital

Transportation Act of 1960, and the National Capital Transportation Agency transmitted a draft copy of the revised transit development program 1967 report for review and comment to the various governing bodies, regulatory bodies, regional organizations, private transit companies and unions representing their employees, and others specified in that section of the act.

Following is a list of those endorsing the modified system:

Local governing bodies: District of Columbia Commissioners, Montgomery County (Md.) Council, Prince Georges County (Md.) Commissioners, Arlington County (Va.) Board, Fairfax County (Va.) Board of Supervisors, Loudon County (Va.) Board of Supervisors, City of Alexandria (Va.) Mayor, Falls Church (Va.), City Council.

Regulatory bodies: Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission.

Planning bodies: Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, Washington Suburban Transit Commission, Northern Virginia Transportation Commission, National Capital Planning Commission, Council of Governments, Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission, Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Federal City Council, National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board.

Transit companies: D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, Virginia and Maryland Coach Co., Inc.

Unions: Amalgamated Transit Union (Local 689).

Further, the proposed modification to add the line to serve Southwest Washington has the strong support of two Committees within the executive branch of the Government having clear interests and responsibilities on which the modifications bear significantly.

One of these, the Southwest Area Transportation Committee, consists of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, and representatives of the Department of Defense, Department of the Treasury, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, the Smithsonian Institution, and various official organizations having cognizance of planning, traffic movement, and related matters on behalf of the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government.

The other committee, the Advisory Committee on Federal Buildings in the National Capital region, was created at the direction of the President early in 1966 and consists of the Administrator of GSA as Chairman; the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Administration; the Engineer Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia; the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission; the Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts; and the Administrator of NCTA.

This Committee, charged with responsibility for developing and maintaining current and long-range plans for the provision of Federal office space in the National Capital region, and reporting its progress to the President, has noted the developing transportation problem in the Southwest. Unanimously, the Committee adopted a resolution urging provision of rapid rail transit service to the

Southwest area such as that under consideration today.

CONCLUSION

Your committee believes that the proposed modifications of the transit system, as reflected in H.R. 11395, are completely justified.

The addition of the line to serve the Southwest area of Washington is fully supported. Certainly, the needs of the Federal Government alone in this area are such that this service should be provided as an acceleration of the authorized system and as a necessary adjunct to the basic rapid rail system.

Likewise, the committee supports the deletion of the Columbia Heights spur as not being economically justified according to the testimony presented, and for the other reasons offered by the National Capital Transportation Agency.

At the same time, the current studies being made by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority—successor to the NCTA—of the North-Central area of Washington, indicate further consideration will have to be given by the Congress to the needs of this area in the months ahead. Meanwhile, the Congress must proceed to enable the Agency to meet its other commitments and projected schedules. The approval of H.R. 11395 would effectuate this purpose, and your committee urges its adoption.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 11395, amends the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 authorizing the preparation of a transit development program for the National Capital region and to further the objectives of the act of July 15, 1960:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 204(c) of the Act of July 14, 1960 (40 U.S.C. 664(c); 74 Stat. 540), section 3(b) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. 681; 79 Stat. 664) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3(b). The work authorized by this section shall be subject to the provisions of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules contained in the aforesaid report, as modified in the report of the Agency entitled 'Revised Transit Development Program for the Nation's Capital, 1967', and shall be subject to the following:"

Stated simply, this proposed amendment of the authorized transit system for the Nation's Capital alters the alignment of the authorized routes to provide for—

First. For full service to the new and fast growing Southwest complex of new Government buildings;

Second. Service to the Hill; and

Third. Elimination of a weak line that would be a burden on the entire system.

Representing the National Capital Transportation Agency before the committee, Mr. Walter J. McCarter, the Administrator, and a man recognized as the outstanding transit expert in the Nation, made some significant statements. I would like to quote him here as I believe that his own words will best explain the

need for H.R. 11395 to be approved by this body:

With your permission, I should like first to report to you on the status of the authorized system, before urging the changes which I feel should be made. My background and experience of more than 45 years in the transit business, additional information not available when the 1965 plan was formulated, and some rather startling changes within the city of Washington, have all combined to produce my recommendations for change in that plan. I feel that you should have this report, and I believe that my report will be of assistance to you in reaching a decision about the changes.

I was appointed Administrator of NCTA in May 1965, not long after this committee had approved NCTA's Transit Development Program 1965. The legislation passed the House in July, the Senate in August, and on September 8, 1965, it was approved by the President (P.L. 89-173). Shortly thereafter, in October, Congress appropriated funds to permit the start of engineering and other work along the long path to actual construction.

In the course of reviewing our request for funds for 1966, the Chairman and Members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies expressed concern whether or not certain traffic or patronage estimates of the Agency were sufficiently current or had been established by adequately sophisticated techniques. I was directed to arrange for an independent, professional study of probable patronage. This was welcome direction inasmuch as I felt that the results of the study would be of assistance to me in the review of the 1965 plan which I knew I must make. I had doubts about some elements of the 1965 plan. Pursuant to this direction from the Appropriations Subcommittee, I arranged for a study by an outstanding firm of traffic engineers.

At about the same time contracts were negotiated with highly competent general engineering consultants and with equally able architects to press ahead with the work to be done before detailed design and actual construction could be undertaken. A contract was negotiated for a comprehensive program of soil testing to obtain information about subsurface conditions essential to subway design.

I am pleased to report that we have completed, in a span of only 18 months, the aerial mapping, the base line control surveys, and the general plans—with the definitive calculated alignments and profiles—for those routes scheduled for early construction. In addition, directive drawings, design criteria, and standard construction specifications are complete.

This brings me back to the traffic study. The results of the traffic study, the application of those results by the technicians, and my own judgment concerning their significance compel me to recommend the changes in plan which you are now considering.

First, let me reassure you—the study of the traffic engineering firm (p. 64) indicated that Agency estimates of annual patronage were only 2½ percent high, and, in fact, that the Agency estimates of peak hour patronage had been low.

There was an important difference between the conditions under which the Agency made its estimates of traffic for the authorized system and the conditions under which the traffic engineering firm made its later study. Where it had been necessary for the Agency to work without the assistance of local bus operators, the traffic engineering firm had the fullest cooperation from them. In consequence, they were able to conduct one of the largest origin and destination studies of bus riders ever conducted.

Two significant findings resulted. First,

the Columbia Heights route proved to be the weakest in the system, producing an estimated 3,100 passengers in its peak hour, instead of 6,700 originally forecast by the Agency. This volume of 3,100 does not justify rail rapid transit. Parenthetically, let me say that there is another reason why the Columbia Heights line should not be built—and a reason why this action should be entirely acceptable to the community. We feel that the needs of north central Washington, including the Shaw Urban Renewal Area, would be better and more efficiently served by construction of an independent route in either the 7th or 14th Street traffic corridors as part of an expanded regional rail system now being studied by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The building of the Columbia Heights line would foreclose this more desirable route.

Second, the study showed that downtown traffic congestion would not be alleviated by the authorized system to the extent that the Agency had expected. The Federal employment center in Southwest Washington proved to be a source of really tremendous patronage. We found that large numbers would ride the rail system to G Street and then transfer to buses to complete their travel to the Southwest. During the peak hour, at the 12th and G Street Station, 70 buses would be required, and at 8th and G Street, 50 buses would be needed, to handle transfer traffic. Obviously, this would make traffic conditions worse rather than better. And fare-splits with the bus company would be greater than had been anticipated, thus reducing rail transit revenues.

It was clear to me that system routing required re-examination. Along with the patronage figures and the traffic congestion problem there were operating characteristics of the authorized system which were not attractive to me. Working with the planning and engineering staff of the Agency, I concluded that the system should probably be changed in the fashion proposed in H.R. 11395. To obtain patronage figures of the changed system, I directed the same traffic engineering firm to examine this system as they had the other. In that way I was able to obtain recent and comparable traffic studies for the system authorized in 1965, and for the system which contains my recommendations for change.

These studies show that, in 1980, the modified system will attract an estimated 12,000 more riders than the authorized system during the peak hour, about 70,000 more riders daily, and some 22,300,000 more riders annually. Operating costs are not expected to be significantly different than those for the authorized system. Thus, we expect that in 1980 the increased patronage on the modified system, when compared with the new traffic figures for the authorized system, would produce additional net annual revenue—after operating costs and payment for feeder buses—of approximately \$3.5 million. Applied to bond debt service expense and assuming an interest rate of 5½ percent per annum, such added annual revenue would be sufficient to fund \$55 million of added capital costs over a 40-year period.

This amount of additional revenue would more than cover the net increase in capital costs which would result from the recommended modifications. Our estimates indicate that the provision of service to Southwest Washington, as proposed, would increase the cost of the basic system at current prices by \$98 million. This increase, however, would be reduced substantially by the \$56.5 million reduction which would result from deleting the Columbia Heights line. Thus, the net increase in capital cost is \$41.5 million, which can be financed from the additional revenues generated by the modifications.

The portions of Mr. McCarter's testimony that I have just read to you do, I

believe, express the need to pass H.R. 11395 today.

I would, however, like to emphasize that H.R. 11395, while modifying the authorized transit system, does not call upon the Congress for additional funds. It merely asks us to approve route changes that will result in greatly improved transit service for the Nation's Capital.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to enthusiastically endorse H.R. 11395, which modifies the authorized transit system approved by the Congress in 1965 for the Washington metropolitan area.

This bill provides a most realistic approach to one of the major transportation problems which have developed in the District. The problem has been brought about by the extensive building program in Southwest Washington—a program that includes both Government buildings and private development which will include office buildings, stores, and a new hotel.

In the Government center alone employment is expected to approach a population figure nearly as great as in all of downtown Baltimore. The new Forrestal Building, which will be a sort of downtown Pentagon; the huge new headquarters of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and the extensive population explosion brought about by the establishment of the Department of Transportation whose employees spill over into a half dozen new office buildings in Southwest; NASA, HEW, USIA—these are the major Government establishments in the area, but in point of numbers they represent just a few of the Government agencies which will eventually be housed in this new exploding population center.

Most of the employees in this complex will come from Maryland and Virginia—well over two-thirds of them. The balance will, of course, be residents of the District of Columbia. The parking facilities in these agencies will be at a minimum. During the peak hours, bus transfer from the Federal Triangle to Southwest will involve between 70 and 100 bus loads.

I could go on and describe the almost frightening development of congestion in downtown Washington that we face if we do not authorize the new transit line as provided in H.R. 11395, to run down D Street through the Southwest area and connect with other lines of the transit system in such a way as to provide residents of the entire region with quick, economical, and comfortable travel from home to office and return.

It is my understanding that the net additional cost of this Southwest area line will be in the nature of \$41 million more. However, I also understand that the increased number of riders of this line will provide sufficient revenue to obtain the amount necessary for debt amortization so that an equivalent amount of additional bonds can be sold to cover this extra cost.

I earnestly commend this bill to my colleagues for favorable action.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, favorable ac-

tion on this legislation, H.R. 11395, today will go far toward the development of the strongest possible rapid rail transit system for the Washington metropolitan area. While I regret the deletion of a short line to the center city, I am convinced that the only way any District or suburban resident will ever enjoy any type of rail transit system is by planning and building a system that has the best chance of paying for itself.

In a letter to Gen. Jackson Graham, general manager of the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority, on September 1, 1967, I expressed my concern with the need to serve the center city, and strongly recommended the future planning to include a midcity line as part of the proposed regional system. I urged the Authority to give serious consideration to a maximum-service line connecting north-central Washington with downtown while providing equally direct access to the suburbs where many jobs are located. The Authority has assured me that they are giving such a route serious and favorable attention.

Addition of the Independence Avenue line, as provided here, will increase annual ridership of the entire system by 22 million, thereby strengthening the system economically and making a sound base for future extensions to serve the city as well as the suburbs.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my concern over the changes H.R. 11395 would make in Washington's projected subway system. The bill would authorize a new route to serve the rapidly expanding Southwest Washington area. I think this is a most necessary change, and one that will speed rush-hour transportation for the many thousands of employees who will be pouring into an area that houses, among other things, the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation. I am doubtful about the wisdom of discontinuing plans to construct a route through the Columbia Heights area of the city. While the statistics presented by the Washington Metropolitan Transportation Agency in support of its proposal seem persuasive, the fact remains that there will now be no subway route servicing the low-income inner city area. In this time of urban discontent, when one of the chief problems is unemployment among ghetto residents, and unavailability of cheap and convenient mass transportation only aggravates this problem, it seems an inappropriate and impolitic moment to eliminate the one subway line which would serve these people. WMTA has promised further studies of the issue and that special attention will be paid to urban renewal developments in the Shaw area. I urge the WMTA to take prompt action and not view today's passage of H.R. 11395 as any kind of go-slow mandate. It is essential that we provide fast, accessible and reasonably priced transportation for our core-city residents. And the sooner the better.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on all District bills considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMEND SECTION 11 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 10213) to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1125).

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10213

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1132), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 35-410), is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following: "This paragraph shall not apply to an alien company which maintains in the United States as required by law, assets held in trust for the benefit of the United States policyholders in an amount not less than the sum of its required capital deposit and the amount of its outstanding liabilities arising out of its insurance transactions in the United States."

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 10213 is to amend section 11 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1125) to eliminate a technical provision which adversely affects alien life insurance companies operating in the District of Columbia.

PRESENT LAW

Title 35 of the District of Columbia Code includes the Insurance Code and chapter 4 thereof sets forth the District of Columbia Department of Insurance requirements with respect to life insurance companies. Section 34-410 of the District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, prohibits an alien life insurance company—that is, a life insurance company not domiciled in the United States—doing business in the District from including in its advertising information as to its financial condition other than the capital stock and assets held by its U.S. branch. The total financial condition of such a company, as included in its annual report to the policyholders of its domicile, may be revealed in the District of Columbia only to the company's policyholders in the District. This latter permission was granted these alien life insurance companies by amendment to this section in 1963 by Public Law 88-193 (77 Stat. 347).

Section 35-410 was again amended in 1966, by Public Law 89-599 (80 Stat. 705), which permitted life insurance companies in the District, both alien and domestic, to issue public announcement of their financial condition at any time, on a current basis rather than on the

basis of the data in its next preceding annual report to the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance.

This latter amendment, constructive though it was and in the interest of the buying public, did not in any way alleviate the problem confronting these alien life insurance companies in the District of Columbia in not being allowed to inform the public, other than their own local policyholders, as to their complete financial condition.

PROVISION OF THE BILL

The bill H.R. 10213 is designed to eliminate this problem, by relieving an alien life insurance company from that prohibition in all cases where such company maintains in the United States, as required by law, assets held in trust for the benefit of its U.S. policyholders in an amount not less than the sum of its required capital deposit and the amount of its outstanding liabilities arising out of its insurance transactions in the United States. In short, this proposed amendment to section 35-410 of the District of Columbia Code would permit the public, policyholders, and prospective policyholders alike, the benefit of full information concerning the capital stock and assets of an alien life insurance company, when sufficient of these assets are held in trust in the United States for the proper protection of the U.S. policyholders.

REASONS FOR LEGISLATION

Your committee is informed that this bill will affect only eight alien insurance companies operating in the District of Columbia, all of which are domiciled in Canada.

These companies are:

- The Canada Life Assurance Co., Toronto, Ontario.
- Confederation Life Association, Toronto, Ontario.
- Crown Life Insurance Co., Toronto, Ontario.
- The Great-West Life Assurance Co., Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- The Manufacturers Life Insurance Co., Toronto, Ontario.
- The National Life Assurance Co., Toronto, Ontario.
- North American Life Assurance Co., Toronto, Ontario.
- Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada, Montreal, Quebec.

The Canadian companies are required by the laws of all the States in which they operate to maintain at all times in the United States, trustee assets sufficient to meet their obligations to U.S. policyholders, plus a required capital deposit. In actual practice, your committee is advised, the companies maintain deposits which substantially exceed these requirements.

These companies naturally need to conduct a certain amount of advertising in the United States if they are to compete on even terms with U.S. companies. The District Code, as it now stands, handicaps these companies in the conduct of their business in the District in that they are not permitted to advertise, publish, or give out their total financial results as published in their annual reports. In fact, the present law can be

interpreted to prohibit an annual report being given to a prospective new policyholder, even on request. Two or three States do have special requirements somewhat similar to those in the District. However, these States have adopted a simple routine which allows the Canadian companies to advertise total business figures without restriction.

Practically all State laws, and those of the District, contain a prohibition against the use of misleading information in advertising, and properly so. But State insurance departments have not construed this provision as requiring any limitation on the publication of total business figures by the Canadian companies. The Canadian companies naturally prefer to be in a position to draft advertisements in the United States which can be used nationwide. It is obvious that to make adjustments for an individual jurisdiction, as the District of Columbia, is a costly procedure, and should not be required unless some useful purpose is served thereby.

Your committee is informed that Canada allows complete freedom to U.S. life insurance companies to advertise their total business figures. This situation exists despite a requirement for the filing of figures of Canadian business similar to the treatment of the U.S. business of Canadian companies. Indeed, the extent of the Canadian operations alone of U.S. companies is rarely emphasized, and total business figures appear in substantially all publications.

PUBLIC HEARING

A hearing on this proposed legislation was conducted by Subcommittee No. 1 on October 2, 1967. At this time, testimony in favor of the bill was submitted by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance, and spokesmen for the Life Insurance Association of America, the American Life Convention, and the Sun Life Assurance Co., of Canada. No opposition was expressed to the enactment of the bill.

CONCLUSIONS

It is the view of your committee that this bill, by allowing these Canadian life insurance companies, which maintain by law adequate trusted assets in the United States, to use their total financial figures in promoting their operations in the District of Columbia, will result in permitting the companies' prospective policyholders to obtain more information than is available to them under present law. This appears definitely to be in the public interest, and accordingly your committee strongly approves the enactment of this proposed legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CERTAIN CIVIL ACTIONS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 6527) to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions

for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6527

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

SECTION 1. (a) Chapter 3 of title 12 of the District of Columbia Code (relating to limitation of actions) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 12-310. Actions arising out of death or injury caused by defective or unsafe improvements to real property.

"(a) (1) Except as provided in subsection (b), any action—

"(A) to recover damages for—

"(i) personal injury,

"(ii) injury to real or personal property,

or

"(iii) wrongful death, resulting from the defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property, and

"(B) for contribution or indemnity which is brought as a result of such injury or death, shall be barred unless the action is commenced before the period specified in paragraph (2) has elapsed.

"(2) The period referred to in paragraph (1) is—

"(A) two years from the date such injury or death occurred, or

"(B) four years from the date the improvement was substantially completed, whichever occurs first.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, an improvement

"For purposes of this subsection, an improvement to real property shall be considered substantially completed when—

"(A) it is first used, or

"(B) it is first available for use after having been completed in accordance with the contract or agreement covering the improvement, including any agreed changes to the contract or agreement, whichever occurs first.

"(b) The limitation of actions prescribed in subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any action based on a contract, express or implied, or

"(2) any action brought against the person who, at the time the defective or unsafe condition of the improvement to real property caused injury or death, was the owner of or in actual possession or control of such real property."

(b) The table of sections for such chapter 3 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"§ 12-310. Actions arising out of death or injury caused by defective or unsafe improvements to real property."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by section 1 of this Act shall apply only with respect to actions brought after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "That".

On page 2, strike out lines 14 through 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall be barred unless in the case where injury is the basis of such action, such injury occurs within the five-year period beginning on the date the improvement was substantially completed, or in the case where death is the basis of such action, either such death or the injury resulting in such death occurs within such five-year period.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, an improvement"

On page 3, between lines 16 and 17, strike out "§".

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 6527 is to provide a limitation on the period of time during which an action may be brought to recover damages, contribution, or indemnity, against architects, designers, engineers, or contractors on the ground of a defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property. At the present time in the District of Columbia there is no limitation as to the period of liability of an architect, engineer, or contractor for a defective or unsafe condition in an improvement to real property. Thus, such parties may become defendants in a suit brought by a person who sustains a personal injury in a building which was built 25 or even 50 years ago. The only limitation applying in such case under District of Columbia law is that such an action must be brought within 3 years after the date of the cause of action accrues.

The bill, H.R. 6527, as amended, and reported by your committee, would require that such an action would be barred unless it is brought within 5 years from the date the improvement to real property was substantially completed.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

In recent years there has been a substantial increase in the number of actions for the recovery of damages, contribution, or indemnity, for injury to property or persons or wrongful death against architects, engineers, and contractors, based upon a defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property.

The District of Columbia, as was the case in the States, has no statute of limitations relating to such actions. Architects who design buildings or improvements to real property, engineers who design and install equipment, or contractors, who build the improvements under rigid inspection and conformity with building codes, may find themselves named as defendants in such damage suits many years after the improvement was completed and occupied.

Comparatively, modern architecture, engineering, and construction, with the new techniques, technology, and methods, may give the appearance of defective or unsafe conditions to older structures which conditions may be used as a basis for such damage suits. In such cases, the architectural plans used may have been discarded, copies of building codes in force at the time of design or construction may no longer be in existence, and the persons who were individually involved may have deceased or may not be located. The purpose of the law is to provide a reasonable time and opportunity for a person who has suffered injury or damages to bring an action. To permit the bringing of such actions without any limitation as to time places the defendant in an unreasonable position if not imposing the impossibility of asserting a reasonable defense.

At hearings before your committee, specific cases were mentioned to illustrate the need for the pending legislation. In one case an architectural firm designed an auditorium which was built in 1928. In 1965, a visitor to the auditor-

rium fell on the stairway and was injured. Her allegation in a suit for damages against the owner was that her injury was due to the improper location of a handrail. The owner of the building, in turn, filed suit against the architect for alleged negligence in designing the stairway and handrail. Thus, 38 years after the completion of the construction the architectural firm is now defending itself against a \$50,000 lawsuit.

In another instance an engineering firm designed a grain elevator which was built in 1934. The elevator was destroyed by an explosion in 1957. In 1959, the owner sued the engineer for \$250,000 alleging that the explosion was due to errors in the design of the ventilation system.

In the first case, none of the architects involved in the design of the auditorium is alive today but the architectural firm is being sued. The plans, specifications, and contracts may have been lost or destroyed. Old building codes, essential to the defense cannot be found. In the grain elevator case, the plaintiff in effect alleged that the engineer should have created in 1934 a ventilation system based on 1959 standards and technology.

Architects, engineers, and contractors have no control over an owner whose neglect in maintaining an improvement may cause dangerous or unsafe conditions to develop over a period of years. They cannot prevent an owner from using an improvement for purposes for which it was not designed. Nor can they prevent the owner of a building from making alterations or changes which may, years afterward, be determined unsafe or defective and appear to be a part of the original improvement.

Your committee believes that as a matter of good law, in fairness and equity to the architect, designer, engineer and builder, it is proper to enact legislation such as H.R. 6527 to establish a reasonable time limit within which suits for damages alleging defective or unsafe conditions, attributable to their actions, can be brought.

STATE ENACTMENTS

The problem which this legislation is designed to remedy has been recognized throughout the United States. Since 1960, 30 States have enacted statutes of limitation similar to that proposed in this bill. In addition, the legislatures in 10 other States are considering such legislation. Your committee finds that the provisions of the bill are reasonably comparable to legislation enacted in the States.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The bill as introduced provided that any action to recover damages for personal injury or injury to real or personal property, or for wrongful death or for contribution or indemnity as a result of injury or death, such action must be commenced within 2 years after the date of the injury or death and that the cause of action must have accrued within 4 years of the date the improvement to the real property was substantially completed. The Committee amendment other than technical changes, was directed toward having the terms of the bill har-

monize with the existing provisions of law on limitations of actions—District of Columbia Code, section 12-301—and to extend the time from 4 to 5 years after the date of substantial completion of the improvement during which period a cause of action might accrue.

The effect of this amendment is that if a cause of action accrues at any time up to and including the last day of the 5-year period from the date the improvement was substantially completed, an action in damages for injury to real or personal property could be filed within 3 years—District of Columbia Code, section 12-301(3)—in the case of personal injury an action could be filed within 3 years—District of Columbia Code, section 12-301(3)—and in the case of wrongful death, an action could be filed within 1 year—District of Columbia Code, section 16-2702.

For the establishment of the date on which the time limitation was to begin to run, the bill provides that the term "substantially completed" shall mean, first, the date on which the improvement is first used or, second, the date on which the improvement is first available for use, whichever occurs first. In the first case, the owner of an improvement may desire to use the property before completion of all details required under the contracts or agreements between the parties involved in the design and construction. The 5-year limitation would begin to run from the date of such first use by the owner.

In the second case, the owner for reasons of his own convenience, may delay use of the improvement for some period after physical completion. The 5-year limitation would begin to run on such date as the owner and other parties agreed that the improvement had been completed in accordance with all contracts or agreements concerning it, including any agreed changes.

The limitation on actions provided in the bill does not apply to or affect the owner's contract or the warranties of an architect, contractor, or engineer in relation to the improvement. Similarly, the limitations do not apply to any action which may be brought against the owner or person in actual possession or control of such improvement for injury or death because of a defective or unsafe condition in the improvement.

The terms of the bill apply only to those actions which are brought following the date of enactment, thus preserving any existing actions.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

At committee hearings, your committee received testimony and statements from representatives of organizations whose members were interested in the legislation. Among those organizations represented at the hearing were the following: The Potomac Valley Chapter of the American Institute of Architects; Associated Builders and Contractors, Metropolitan Washington Chapter; the Washington Building Congress; the Washington Metropolitan Chapter of the American Institute of Architects; the National Society of Professional Engineers; the Consulting Engineers' Council of the United States for Metropolitan

Washington; and the District of Columbia Society for Professional Engineers.

The report of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia on H.R. 6527 was presented by a representative of the office of the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia who indicated that the Commissioners had no objections to the legislation.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 6527, to establish a limitation on the period of time during which an action may be brought in the District of Columbia to recover damages, contribution or indemnity against architects, designers, engineers, or contractors on the ground of a defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property. This measure is identical in intent to my bill, H.R. 11544.

The proponents of this bill, and others engaged in the building industry in the District of Columbia and Maryland, have discussed with me the difficulties which they now face in the absence of any statute of limitations. Recent decisions of the courts have placed an extreme burden upon architects, engineers, builders, and all engaged in construction. They may be liable for their actions many years after completing their work, long after essential witnesses and records may have become unavailable, and long after technical advances may have made their prior work difficult or impossible to defend, although the practices may have been entirely proper and reasonable when undertaken.

This bill would both protect the building industry and continue reasonable protections for injured parties. A sensible time is allowed for commencement of an action, and even following the period of limitation the injured party could bring a claim against the owner or other person in control of the property. Thus this bill balances the interest of all concerned in a way very similar to laws recently enacted by a majority of the States.

I wish to commend the District of Columbia Committee for its prompt consideration of this legislation, and fully support its passage today.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXEMPT PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 9059) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations, and ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would just like to ask if these public international organizations as defined in the bill deserve this protection; and whom are we doing a favor—the employees of the organization—by keeping them outside the laws of our unemployment compensation; or are we doing them a disfavor?

I understand that it is the FAO and the ILO and the U.N. Information Center that are left. But try as I will, from the reading of the reports of the departments and the committee report, I am honestly not sure whether we are doing these employees—and I suppose that they are U.S. citizens working for these organizations—a favor by keeping them out of our unemployment compensation laws; or whether we are doing a disfavor to U.S. citizens who might be working in this information center of the U.N., for example.

I well realize that there is a question of reciprocity with other countries. Our employees, for example, who work in a similar organization in Geneva, may come under a similar Swiss law.

But I wonder if the gentleman, under my reservation of objection, would take the time to explain the pressure for this kind of legislation. I realize it has been requested by our Department of State—and they do not always come through to me loud and clear.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. This bill came at the request of the Department of State. Usually these things are handled by treaty. Most of the organizations, situated as these are, are exempt by treaty.

I believe there are only two such international organizations located in the United States; one of them is the United Nations organization in New York and the Pan-American Union, of course, located here in Washington. These offices here in Washington are regional offices of other international organizations and it just puts them in the same position as other international organizations that are already exempt. They are presently exempt from other taxation and all this does is to exempt them from registering and from the payment of this particular tax in the District of Columbia. There are only 75 or 100 people involved.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, would the gentleman advise the Members whether this is in his opinion, and I respect his opinion, is a favor or a disfavor to a U.S. citizen who might be working for one of these international organizations in the District of Columbia? In other words, they are employees and they should have the right to unemployment compensation. I would just appreciate the gentleman's candid opinion. Do I understand we are only doing here what has been done for others by treaty?

Mr. DOWDY. I made no inquiry about how many of these 75 to 100 people who are involved are U.S. citizens and how

many are foreign nationals. I would expect that at least part of them and maybe all of them are foreign nationals. Perhaps they would be sent back home if their connection with these offices was discontinued.

Mr. HALL. I can see why it would be an advantage to exempt a foreign national working here from the U.S. unemployment compensation laws. But it would strike me that the shoe has to apply also to the other foot—of the U.S. citizen—but apparently that information is not available.

Will the gentleman further advise the House, under this reservation, whether or not we are simply putting into law what the President has already done under his Executive order anyway, as far as these employees are concerned, and as far as exempting those employees from unemployment compensation is concerned?

Mr. DOWDY. I cannot answer for these two or three small regional offices. All other international organizations are exempt, of course, by treaty, and that would be carried out by Presidential action. I do not know that there is any order. I think not. If it were handled by Presidential order, this bill probably would not be called for.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to press too deeply. Does the gentleman or his staff know if these people are presently covered by Executive order and thereby exempt?

Mr. DOWDY. As I have said, this action is requested by the State Department. It does the same thing in respect to the employees concerned as we do with respect to congressional employees. Employees in our congressional offices are exempt.

Mr. HALL. I am sorry. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. I say the employees in our congressional offices are likewise exempt. At least the employees in our offices are not subject to unemployment compensation taxes. The proposition with reference to the offices concerned in the bill is similar.

Mr. HALL. Of course, there is a different reason for that, I am sure the gentleman will agree with me. There is the question of tenure, the right of Capitol Hill appointment, et cetera, et cetera, separation without pay, and serving at the pleasure of the individual Representatives of the people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if the United Nations Information Center referred to here is the U.S. branch of the Information Center of the United Nations, or is this the United Nations Information Center located in New York?

Mr. DOWDY. It is my understanding that it is a regional office of the United Nations. In other words, these three—the United Nations Information Center, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization—have mere regional offices here in Washington. They are regional offices of an organization that is located elsewhere.

The International Labor Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization I think are not even located in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Are U.S. employees of the United Nations exempt from taxes, or does not the story go this way, that they pay taxes to the U.S. Government and are then reimbursed by the United Nations? Does the gentleman have any knowledge on this subject?

Mr. DOWDY. It is my understanding that those employees are exempt from income taxes. But this bill relates only to unemployment compensation taxes in the District of Columbia. That is all this relates to.

Mr. GROSS. Only to unemployment taxes?

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct. That is all this relates to.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas whether or not the International Labor Organization is one of those which would be so exempt.

Mr. DOWDY. That organization has a regional office here in the District of Columbia, and they would be exempt from payment of District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation taxes.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Am I to understand further that the International Labor Organization, its regional office acting as an employer, seeks to exempt its employees from the withholding or payment of unemployment compensation taxes?

Mr. DOWDY. Our request came from the State Department. I assume the State Department was requested by these organizations to get the exemption for them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is being done by Executive order, we are merely legalizing that action. Since it is done in other and similar situations by treaties, therefore we must presume that the action is taken in the interest of equity and justice. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 9059, which is requested by the State Department, is to exempt certain public international organizations, which have headquarters or regional offices in the District of Columbia, from registering with the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board and from the payment of the unemployment compensation tax required by the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act—District of Columbia Code, title 46, section 301.

The international organizations exempted by the bill would be those designated by Executive order of the President as entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided

under the International Organizations Immunities Act—22 U.S.C. 288–288f-1.

Section 288 of that act defines an "international organization" as "a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided" in the United States Code.

Under the International Organizations Immunities Act, it is further provided that where the United States participates in a public international organization either by treaty or by act of Congress authorizing an appropriation therefor, the President may designate that organization as being entitled to certain privileges and immunities, such as exemption from payment of taxes, inviolability of its records and property, and exemption of its non-American employees from U.S. income taxes, and from process as to their official actions.

PRESENT SITUATION

The State Department has advised your committee that with the exception of the United Nations organization, located in New York City, and the Pan-American Union, located in Washington, most public international organizations have their headquarters abroad, in Geneva, Switzerland, or other locations. However, some of these organizations do have small regional offices in Washington, which act as clearinghouses for information channeled to their main offices abroad.

Many such public international organizations with regional offices in the District, such as the International Bank for Construction and Development, are already exempt by treaty from local taxes.

There are only a few very small regional offices in the District not so exempt, as the United Nations Information Center, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization, employing a total of but 75 to 100 persons.

H.R. 9059 would give these remaining public international organizations the same exempt status as others now enjoy, and your committee recommends the bill be approved by the House.

ENDORSEMENT OF LEGISLATION

Not only is the bill urged by the State Department but it is approved by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and by the Federal Bureau of the Budget. No opposition to the bill has been expressed to your committee.

Letters from the State Department and the District of Columbia Commissioners on behalf of this proposed legislation are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1967.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress proposed legislation to amend the "District of Columbia Unemployment Com-

pensation Act, As Amended", Public Law 424, 87th Congress. The proposed amendment would exempt certain public international organizations having a headquarters or regional office in the District of Columbia from the payment of an excise tax to the District of Columbia. The proposed amendment would not involve additional expense to the United States nor would the proposed amendment in any way diminish, abridge or weaken the right or power of the United States to safeguard its security.

The provision proposed to be added by the amendment would have the following effect:

Section T would exempt from the coverage of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, As Amended, services performed after April 1, 1962 in the employ of public international organizations designated by Executive Order of the President as being entitled to the benefit of the International Organizations Immunities Act, Public Law 291—79th Congress, 59 Stat. 669, 22 U.S.C. 288. The provision would exempt the designated public international organizations from the requirement of registering with the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board and from paying the unemployment compensation tax required by the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, As Amended.

A similar communication is being sent to the President of the Senate.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS deB. KATZENBACH,
Acting Secretary.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, June 20, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of
Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 9059, 90th Congress, a bill "To amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that Act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations." The purpose of this bill is to exempt from coverage of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act services performed after April 1, 1962 in the employ of public international organizations designated by Executive Order of the President as being entitled to the benefits of the International Organizations Immunities Act.

The bill amends section 1(b)(5) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-310(b)(5)), by adding at the end thereof a new clause (T), and its passage would have the effect of relieving designated public international organizations from the requirement of registering with the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board and from paying the unemployment compensation tax required by such Act.

The Commissioners offer no objection to enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9059

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b)(5) of section 1 of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46-301(b)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of clauses (P) and (R) and inserting at the end of such clause a semicolon, and

(2) by adding after clause (S) the following new clause:

"(T) service performed after April 1, 1962, in the employ of a public international organization designated by the President as entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided under the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288–288f-1)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INDUSTRIAL SAFETY ACT

MR. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11638) to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Act of September 19, 1918 (D.C. Code, secs. 36-431–36-442) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2 of such title (D.C. Code, sec. 36-432) is amended—

(A) by striking out in paragraph (a) "industrial employment, place of employment," and inserting in lieu thereof "place of employment", and

(B) by striking out in paragraph (d) "industrial". (2) Section 3 of such title (D.C. Code, sec. 36-433) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "To promote the safety of persons employed in buildings or other structures, such rules, regulations, and standards may require, without limitation, changes in the permanent or temporary features of such buildings or other structures."

(3) Section 6 of such title (D.C. Code, sec. 36-436) is amended by striking out "Provided, however, That the Board" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Any decision of the Board denying a variation from any such rule or regulation may be made only after the Board has afforded the employer requesting such variation a reasonable opportunity for a public hearing. Such decision shall be subject to review by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals under section 11-742 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code. The Board".

(4) Section 12 of such title (D.C. Code, sec. 36-442) is amended by striking out "more than \$300, or by imprisonment of not exceeding ninety days. Prosecutions for violations of this title shall be in the name of the District of Columbia on information filed in the police court of the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "less than \$100 or more than \$1,000, or by imprisonment of not more than ninety days. Prosecutions for violations of this title shall be in the name of the District of Columbia on information filed in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions."

Sec. 2. Section 11-742(a) of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (9).

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and

(3) by adding after paragraph (10) the following new paragraph:

"(11) decisions of the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board made under section 36-436 denying a request for a variation from a rule or regulation of that Board."

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11638 is to provide for a more general application of the rules and regulations of the safety code of the District of Columbia for the protection of employees in places of employment.

Industrial safety provisions of existing law were added to the minimum wage act by the act of October 14, 1941—55 Stat. 738; District of Columbia Code 36-431, and the following: Following this enactment, the law was construed to apply safety standards in places of employment in the District of Columbia except in the Federal and the District of Columbia government establishments. The act was interpreted to give the Industrial Safety Board the power to establish reasonable standards of safety for the protection of life and health of employees, to conduct inspections and investigations, to enforce reasonable standards, and to cite employers for any violations of provisions of the act or for violation of rules and regulations.

From the date of enactment until 1964, the provisions of the act were interpreted as applying generally to places of private employment in the District of Columbia. However, in 1964 the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia rendered an opinion which limited the application of the provisions of the act to the regulation of safety conditions in "industrial" places of employment, such as manufacturing plants and building construction.

The amendments proposed in H.R. 11638 are designed to restore the general application of safety rules and regulations and the jurisdiction of the Industrial Safety Board to enforce the safety code generally in places of private employment in the District of Columbia.

LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT LAW

Because of the interpretation placed on existing law by the Corporation Counsel in 1964, the great majority of employees in the District do not receive the benefit of the reasonable rules and regulations relating to safety in their places of employment. It is estimated that only approximately 16 percent of all such privately employed persons are now covered by provisions of the Industrial Safety Act. More than 100,000 employees engaged in employment in hotels, restaurants, retail establishments and in offices are now excluded from any coverage or protection under the safety code.

WHAT THE BILL PROVIDES

The bill, H.R. 11638, amends the existing law by striking out the term "industrial" in the definitions carried in the present law so as to make the provisions of the act apply generally to all usual places of private employment. The bill also provides that safety standards, rules and regulations apply without limitation to changes in the permanent or tem-

porary features of places of employment. This is necessary, since buildings which may have been altered or may have had additions or which may have only temporary provisions made for use by employees should be covered by the act. Employees located in such circumstances should receive equal safety protection.

The bill also amends the provisions of existing law relating to applications filed by an employer for a variation from a provision of the safety code rules and regulations. In the application of the safety code, the Industrial Safety Board regulations may be such as to indicate a violation of the regulations in the strict sense of the safety code. Occasionally, such strict application actually accomplishes little or nothing insofar as employee safety is concerned and may work a substantial hardship upon the employer. In such situation, the Board, on application from the employer, may grant a variance relieving the employer from strict application of the rules and regulations.

When the Board receives such an application from an employer, the Board has the discretion to hold a hearing if it so desires. However, the employer is not entitled, as a matter of right, to any hearing before the Board for the purpose of presenting his case. The bill amends present law to provide that in the event an application for variance is made by an employer, and before the Board denies such application, it must hold a public hearing at which the employer may present his case. In the event of an adverse decision by the Board, the employer may appeal the decision of the Board to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. The committee understands that the number of variances applied for by employers is relatively limited and believes that such provision for a public hearing would not place any undue burden upon the Board.

The bill provides for increase penalties for violation of the safety code regulations. Under present law, the penalties provided for violation are a fine of not more than \$300 or imprisonment not exceeding 90 days. Under the bill the penalties for violation would be increased to a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 90 days.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Your committee held hearings at which representatives of employer groups and employee groups presented testimony and statements regarding the provisions of the bill. The greater Washington Central Labor Council, the Retail Store Employees Union, the Office and Professional Employees Union, the Building Service Employees International Union, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, and the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union expressed support for the legislation in behalf of employees.

Representatives of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Subcontractors Association and the Master Builders Association, Inc., presented employer testimony regarding the legislation.

Employer and employee groups generally expressed the need for and desir-

ability of and support for adequate safety code enforcement in the District of Columbia being applied generally to places of employment.

The favorable recommendations of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia were presented to the committee by the Office of the Corporation Counsel. The Chairman of the Industrial Safety and Minimum Wage Board and the Director of Industrial Safety testified in support of the legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 8718, TO INCREASE ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to appoint an additional manager on the part of the House to serve on the conference on the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following additional conferee: Mr. FUQUA.

The Clerk will notify the Senate.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the work of our committee for District day.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the business for District day.

THE CONGRESS SHOULD MEET ITS OWN RESPONSIBILITIES ON MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICIES AND SAVE \$7 BILLION A YEAR ON COST OF INTEREST ON NATIONAL DEBT ALONE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, In recent days we have had a great deal of comment in this Chamber about the responsibilities of the executive branch.

In their enthusiasm, some Members have been issuing directives—and at times, almost ultimatums—to the President of the United States. I have been in the Congress for 39 years and I have the deepest respect for prerogatives and the responsibilities of the legislative branch of our U.S. Government. By the same token, I have learned to respect the constitutional separation of powers.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has no more authority to take over the operation of the executive branch than it does to operate the Supreme Court. Under our Constitution,

the three branches of Government must operate separately. Frankly, I feel that some of the press releases, some of the speeches, and some of the statements which have been issued about fiscal policy in recent days demean the Congress. At a minimum they fail to recognize the separation of powers.

Mr. Speaker, it will do the 90th Congress and its individual Members no good to pass the buck. Under the Constitution we have to stand up on our own feet and meet our own responsibilities.

The truth is, the Congress has been dodging its responsibilities—particularly in the areas of monetary and fiscal policies—for many years. This is why we find ourselves in such a bad situation today. It has become general knowledge throughout the country that the Congress has not, and apparently will not, face responsibility for monetary affairs. In his own conscience, I suppose each Member of this Congress knows why this is true.

As a result of this dereliction of duty, the U.S. Government today is paying many times the interest that should be required to finance its borrowings. This is excessive interest rates that have to be paid by the American taxpayers.

If we had met our responsibility and kept interest rates down, we would not even be faced with the problem of a tax increase.

With lower interest rates, we would have had plenty of money to spend for both our foreign and domestic programs, including the war in Vietnam.

But, by failing to meet our responsibility, interest rates have soared over the past 14 years and, in this fiscal year, we will pay \$14.2 billion interest on the national debt. This sum is second only to the expenditures for national defense. In recent days there has been talk about the need for a budget cut of \$7 billion. Mr. Speaker, we would today be paying exactly \$7 billion less in interest on the national debt if we had kept interest rates at the levels prevailing when President Truman went out of office.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that those who talk the loudest about spending cuts say absolutely nothing about high interest rates. Does it not seem strange that there is no talk on this floor about cutting the second largest item in the budget—interest rates? Surely that is where the economy drive should begin.

Unfortunately, high interest rates are being accepted in the 90th Congress as a way of life. Too many times, I have heard comments that high interest rates are necessary because of the War in Vietnam. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Let me remind my colleagues that we kept interest rates down throughout World War II, a conflict much larger and much more demanding on the economy than our present foray into Vietnam. In fact, interest rates on long-term Government obligations were kept below 2½ percent throughout World War II. Short-term interest rates were as low as three-eighths of 1 percent through this period. These low interest rates saved the American people billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a

table showing the tremendous rise in the yields on long-term Government bonds from 1939 to the present. While some of these rates may appear low, it must be remembered that these are wholesale rates and not retail rates of interest.

Yields on long-term Government bonds, by years, 1939 to present

Year:	[Percent per annum]	Yield
1939	-----	2.36
1940	-----	2.21
1941	-----	1.95
1942	-----	2.46
1943	-----	2.47
1944	-----	2.48
1945	-----	2.37
1946	-----	2.19
1947	-----	2.25
1948	-----	2.44
1949	-----	2.31
1950	-----	2.32
1951	-----	2.57
1952	-----	2.68
1953	-----	2.94
1954	-----	2.56
1955	-----	2.84
1956	-----	3.08
1957	-----	3.47
1958	-----	3.43
1959	-----	4.08
1960	-----	4.02
1961	-----	3.90
1962	-----	3.95
1963	-----	4.00
1964	-----	4.15
1965	-----	4.12
1966	-----	4.65

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD a table showing the total Federal debt and interest paid, fiscal years 1951-68:

TABLE II.—TOTAL, FEDERAL DEBT AND INTEREST PAID, FISCAL 1951-68

Fiscal year	Total Federal debt (millions)	Total interest paid (millions)	Computed annual interest rates	Computed at 1951 rate (millions)
1951	\$255.3	\$5.7	2,233	\$5.7
1952	259.2	5.9	2,276	5.8
1953	266.1	6.6	2,480	5.9
1954	271.3	6.5	2,396	6.1
1955	274.4	6.4	2,332	6.1
1956	272.8	6.8	2,493	6.0
1957	270.6	7.3	2,698	6.1
1958	276.4	7.7	2,786	6.2
1959	284.8	9.3	2,704	6.4
1960	286.5	9.3	3,126	6.5
1961	289.2	9.0	3,112	6.5
1962	298.6	9.2	3,081	6.7
1963	306.5	10.0	3,263	6.8
1964	312.5	10.7	3,424	7.0
1965	317.9	11.4	3,586	7.1
1966	320.4	12.1	3,777	7.2
1967	327.3	13.5	4,125	7.3
1968 ¹	335.4	14.2	4,234	7.5
Total	-----	160.0	-----	116.8

¹ Estimated.

Source: Economic Report of the President, 1967.

Yet today we seem to have a different philosophy, one which smacks of profiteering by the moneylenders in time of war.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has full jurisdiction over the bonded indebtedness of this country. It can control the level of interest rates on borrowings by the U.S. Treasury. In fact, the Liberty Bond Act set a maximum interest rate of 4¼ percent on long-term Government obligations. Obviously the Congress has broad powers in this area and it could do wonders in the fight to lower interest charges on public borrowing.

The Congress could also require the cancellation of the \$47 billion worth of

bonds being held in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. These bonds, part of the Federal Open Market Committee's portfolio, have been paid for in full. Yet the Federal Reserve continues to hold onto these bonds and if they are not canceled and retired, the American taxpayers will be forced to pay for them again.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve each year sends a bill to the U.S. Treasury for interest on these paid-up bonds. Currently the Treasury is paying to the Federal Reserve about \$2 billion annually in interest on the \$47 billion worth of bonds already paid for in full.

This year I testified before the Ways and Means Committee and urged that they require the cancellation of these bonds in the public interest. I placed the text of my testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, October 5, at pages 27953-27962.

Mr. Speaker, I do not condemn any Member for criticism of the President. Certainly this is the prerogative of any Member. However, I do feel strongly that it is time that the Congress meet its own responsibility in the area of fiscal and monetary policies.

All of us in politics recognize that it is easier to pass the buck than to go to work and solve the problems ourselves. In this instance, I hope that the Congress will overcome its inertia and will actually do something about monetary policy and high interest rates—the root of our current fiscal problems.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am sending a report of my activities to the people of the Eighth District of Virginia and would like to share this report with the Members by inserting a copy of it at this point in the RECORD:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, BILL SCOTT, REPORTS

Federal spending: One of the most interesting and probably most important matters considered by the House this year has been the suggested curtailment of total government spending for the current year. Economy-minded members have suggested an overall ceiling of \$131.5 billion representing a cut of \$5 billion on anticipated expenditures. I have voted in favor of this proposal and it appeared to have prevailed by a vote of 202 to 181 only to be reversed a few days later after the Administration rallied its forces and some of the members reversed their stand.

Suggestions have been made that the President should not be given the authority to cut appropriations and that control of the purse strings is the strongest prerogative of Congress. Certainly Congress should control spending and should refuse to appropriate any funds not proven to be essential to the conduct of government business. But placing a ceiling on spending does not increase the power of the President nor prevent the Congress from passing on the wisdom of expendi-

tures for programs below the established ceiling.

The House Ways and Means Committee 20-5 decision to put aside consideration of the President's 10% surtax proposal until an understanding is reached between the White House and the Congress regarding spending cuts is to be applauded.

Even though the country is faced with an anticipated deficit this year of \$30 billion, my present intention is to vote against the surtax because government has a habit of spending all of the money it receives through taxation. I have serious doubt that if additional funds are raised, they will be spent to reduce the deficit rather than to expand existing spending programs or develop new ones.

You may recall that during the last fiscal year, the government expended approximately \$126 billion while receiving approximately \$116 billion; that in January the President estimated total expenditures for the current fiscal year to be slightly over \$135 billion with receipts of approximately \$127 billion; and that on August 2, he revised expenditures for this fiscal year to over \$143 billion and his estimate of receipts to \$120 billion. While a deficit was suggested of \$8 billion in January, it has now been revised to \$23 billion if the 10% surtax is adopted and \$30 billion, if not. In my opinion, it is essential to establish priorities in government spending much as you and I do with our household expenses.

We have grown: According to the Bureau of Population and Economic Research of the University of Virginia, our Eighth District is the largest congressional district in the state with a population now estimated at 544,021.

Committee work: One of my Subcommittees (Compensation and Pension) of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has just completed public hearings on more than 50 bills, all designed to prevent veteran pensioners from losing income as the result of the proposed increase in Social Security. Since the monthly rate of pension is determined by the amount of income received from other sources, it is quite possible for a veteran to receive a modest increase in Social Security payments, and thereby suffer a far greater reduction in pension payments. Certainly, the Nation's aged, needy pensioner should not suffer such a loss as the result of a small increase in pension payments. I plan to support the position that no increase in Social Security payments will result in a reduction in the total income of any person receiving a pension from the Veterans' Administration.

Schedule: You may be interested in my evening schedule for the next 30 days. This does not include a number of commitments primarily of a personal nature.

Oct. 15 Springfield: American Legion Boys and Girls State Program.

Oct. 17 McLean: McLean Business and Professional Association.

Oct. 19 Arlington: Virginia Medical Assn.

Oct. 21 Dulles International Airport: "Freedom Shrine" ceremony by the Exchange Club.

Falls Church: Order of Fraternal Americans.

Oct. 24 McLean: Greater Falls Church Republican Women's Club.

Oct. 25 Bailey's Crossroads: Hunt Clubs.

Oct. 27 Vienna: Reception for candidates.

Oct. 31 Vienna: Chamber of Commerce Halloween parade.

Nov. 1 West Point: King William County Forestry Club.

Nov. 2 Springfield: Reception for candidates.

Nov. 7 Tappahannock: St. Margaret's School Essex County Junior Women's Club.

Nov. 8 Purcellville: Grace Annex Methodist Church.

Nov. 10 Alexandria: Scottish Rite.

Nov. 13 Montross: Westmoreland Ruritan Club.

Hybla Valley landfill: As indicated in the last newsletter many citizens have been concerned about the prospect of bringing trash from the District of Columbia to the Hybla Valley area of Fairfax County. Contacts with the G.S.A., D.C. Government and House District Committee apparently have paid off because it now appears that alternatives have been found. If you hear differently, please let me know so we can get to work on it again.

Three Sisters Bridge: State Highway Commissioner Fugate has urged that the Department of Transportation complete its studies of the Three Sisters Bridge as soon as possible so that the Virginia Highway Department can complete plans for Interstate 66 from the Beltway into Washington. I have also contacted the Secretary of Transportation asking that the studies be completed as early as possible and that he reach a decision on this matter.

Agriculture bulletins: Please send the numbers and titles of the bulletins you wish to receive. Also available are copies of the helpful booklets, "Infant Care" and "Your Child from One to Six."

GS 1: Nutrition up-to-date, up to you.

G 5: Food for the family with young children.

G 13: Food for families with school children.

G 17: Food guide for older folks.

G 72: Nutritive value of foods.

G 74: Food and your weight.

G 85: Food for the young couple.

G 90: Conserving the nutritive values in foods.

L 424: Food for fitness . . . a daily food guide.

G 38: Buying your home sewing machine.

G 59: Simplified clothing construction.

G 107: Clothing repairs.

Something to ponder: Can our country continue fighting an extremely costly war and conquer the earth, the moon, and poverty at the same time?

CONGRESS, NOT THE PRESIDENT, SHOULD MAKE THE DECISIONS ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, ideally, Congress, not the President, should make the decisions on appropriations. Once the President has made his budget suggestions, if they are to be decreased, it should be the Congress that states where the decreases shall be. If these are to be increases, it should be the Congress that states where those increases shall be.

But it should be clearly held in mind that there exists a major point of distinction between appropriations and spending. Generally speaking, appropriation bills passed by the Congress, which create the authority to spend, relate to future fiscal years and future spending. There is thus a certain delay between the action of Congress and the effect on the actual spending of moneys. In addition, the congressional process is generally speaking a rather slow one. First, there are the matters of hearings in one body, then committee deliberations, then floor action, then the entire process is re-

peated in the other body and then possibly necessary compromise between the actions of the two Houses. Only after both bodies of the Congress have acted, and the President has signed the resulting bill, is congressional action really final or effective.

The combination of these two factors means that it is, as a practical matter, impossible for the Congress, acting alone, to have an immediate effect in cutting present spending. The administration, on the other hand, can reduce present spending almost overnight on the basis of proper Executive orders issued in such a manner as to call for immediate action by the various executive departments.

There has been a call by the President for immediate action by the Congress to increase Federal taxation. The Congress has countered by demanding that first there must be sizable cuts in Federal expenditures, and then consideration of the possible need for an income tax increase.

Thus, in one sense, the basic decisions for the Congress to make at this time are twofold. The first is whether action is really urgently called for. The second is whether Congress will insist that cuts precede any serious consideration of an income tax increase.

It is almost unanimously agreed that the fiscal position in which the Nation finds itself at the present time is extremely serious, calling for urgent action.

If the Congress decides, as I believe it should, that there should be definite action in the way of spending cuts before any serious consideration of an increase in income taxes, then we cannot wait for the Congress to move but must insist that the President make these spending cuts and make them immediately.

If one is willing to raise taxes before cutting spending, or if one does not believe that early action is urgently called for, then one can, in good conscience, vote against the proposal to insist that the President cut spending.

If, on the other hand, one believes, as I do, that almost immediate action is called for to stave off the threat of inflation and that spending cuts should precede any serious consideration of a Federal income tax increase, then one has no truly logical stand to take in this matter but to insist that a ceiling be placed on spending with orders to the President to take the necessary executive action immediately to see that such ceiling is enforced.

GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE: PARTNERS FOR JOB DEVELOPMENT IN THE CITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Johnson proposed that Government and private enterprise once

again cooperate in a new pilot program to bring jobs to the thousands of hard-core unemployed of our cities.

The plan is simple. First, encourage existing industry located in central city areas to expand operations and, thereby, create new, good paying jobs. Second, encourage new enterprises to locate in central cities and make new investments which would also create new jobs. Third, encourage large enterprises to join small business in the ghetto in a combined economic effort, again to increase jobs as well as business profits.

I stress the fact that these would be jobs that are necessary to the productive program.

Government's offer—clearly outlined by President Johnson in a memo to leading Government departments—is to utilize \$40 million in allocated funds, plus Government surplus land, equipment, and other materials to make this test project work.

In my opinion, this is a first-class job development program. It aims at creating useful jobs in private enterprise for hard-core unemployed people.

The President has wisely delegated the major responsibility for the administration of this new program to the Department of Commerce and its able Secretary, Alexander B. Trowbridge. Secretary Trowbridge has already appointed a special representative—Mr. William E. Zisch—to oversee the entire program. It will be Mr. Zisch's prime responsibility to serve as a central focus for the interest expressed by industry in this project. And I must say that Mr. Zisch is admirably qualified for the position, since he is vice chairman and former president of the Aerojet General Corp., of Los Angeles. He knows how to administer a cooperative Government-industry program.

As the President said in his memo to all interested Cabinet officers, our Government stands ready to fulfill its responsibility for helping the unemployed get good jobs at decent wages. Private enterprise also understands its responsibility to promote the conditions which strengthen prosperity.

If there was ever an economic program which was advantageous to people, to business, and to the country as a whole, it is the President's test job development program for the cities.

I congratulate all those associated with it. I assure those who join in it that the Congress will be watching for the positive results we know will be forthcoming.

PROGRESSIVE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, October 15-21 this year will be observed as Na-

tional Business Women's Week and will be highlighted by congresses of career women leaders at national, State, and local levels. This annual tribute has been sponsored by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs of America—an organization which numbers among its members, some of the best, the finest citizens of our Nation. Numbered among them are those that constitute a part of that vast number of loyal American women who work for their native land unselfishly and with utmost devotion both in times of peace and in times of war. Constantly do they contribute their skills and devotedly do they give their talents to the growth and prosperity of every State of this Union. Also, numbered among them are the wives and mothers of courageous men now fighting for our survival against the tyrannical and aggressive forces of international communism on the battlefields of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, this splendid and excellent organization of American women has presented to us and to the Nation a forward looking, progressive legislative program in which I am deeply and sincerely interested, and thinking that the other Members of this body will be similarly interested, under unanimous consent previously obtained, I insert that program in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The platform, embracing the program of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs is as follows:

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL CONVENTION, JULY 23-27, 1967, NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

LEGISLATIVE PURPOSES

To elevate standards for the employed woman, to promote her interests, to create a spirit of cooperation, to expand opportunities through industrial, scientific and vocational activities, to secure equal consideration under the law and to establish conditions which assure both men and women the fullest opportunity and reward for the development of their capacities to the maximum potential.

To consider the place and responsibility of the employed woman as a concerned citizen in the complex democratic society of the United States, and to strengthen the role of this nation in world affairs.

ACTION ITEMS

Item 1. Propose and support legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide equality of rights under the law to men and women.

Item 2. Propose and support: (a) legislation in the field of employment which provides uniform laws and regulations for men and women as to working conditions, rates of pay, and equal employment opportunity; and (b) uniform legislation for men and women in the areas of taxation and retirement.

Item 3. Propose and support legislation to provide for uniform jury service and uniform qualifications in the selection of men and women to serve on grand or petit juries in any court.

POLICY ITEM

Support measures within the framework of the Constitution of the United States that promote peace and strengthen national security and make more effective the United Nations and such other international organizations of which the United States is a participant, without relinquishment of our basic freedoms.

WASHINGTON POST JOINS IN TRIBUTE TO EMILY AND PAUL DOUGLAS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reading the editorial page of the Washington Post of October 7, 1967, I was pleased and delighted to find the following editorial in tribute to Emily and Paul Douglas, the former brilliant Representative at large from the State of Illinois, and the former distinguished and beloved former Senator from Illinois, one of the outstanding wife-and-husband teams of the Nation, whose home is in the great Second District of Illinois:

PROPHET WITH HONOR

Although we are awkwardly late in saying so, we want a share in the tributes paid a week ago at Chicago State College to Paul and Emily Douglas. A building on the campus of that institution was named in their honor, and some 270 colleges, universities and learned societies were represented at a convocation acclaiming the Douglasses for their distinguished contributions to the several communities of which they have long been members—the academic community, the City of Chicago, the State of Illinois and the American Republic.

There is a memorial to Paul Douglas in Washington, too. If it lacks brick-and-mortar substance, it is no less real on that account. It hovers incorporeally in the United States Senate, a goad to the consciences and capacities of those Senators who had acquaintance with the independence, integrity and drive of the professional Marine from Illinois. He remains a force in the Senate. It is a pleasure to salute him.

THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1967—ANOTHER JOHNSON INITIATIVE FOR NEEDY AMERICANS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in a ceremony which has received too little public recognition, the President of the United States on September 27 signed into law the Food Stamp Act of 1967 at the White House.

This bold humanitarian program reflects the concern of this administration for the welfare of the people of America.

The food stamp program—which is now being expanded—bears President Johnson's imprint. It was first instituted on a trial basis 3 years ago. It has since been extended to 41 States. Today it is helping to feed 2 million Americans. The new bill authorizes more than \$400 million to be used to help feed needy families over the next 2 years.

This program means help and health for many people who otherwise would not be able to afford proper food.

It means better diets for many hungry children.

It means new outlets for their production for American farmers.

It means that President Johnson and the Nation accept the philosophy that poverty of the body and poverty of the mind can and will be overcome in America.

I include at this point in the RECORD the remarks of President Johnson as he signed the Food Stamp Act at the White House on September 27:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING THE FOOD STAMP ACT, SEPTEMBER 27, 1967

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, Senator Aiken, Senator Byrd, Senator Ellender, Senator Boggs, Chairman Poage, Congresswoman Sullivan, Congressman Purcell, and the other members of the House and Senate who I did not get recorded here:

I welcome one and all of you for the good work that you have done. I think we all share the common view that we want no American in this country to ever go hungry. We believe that we have the knowledge, the compassion, and the resources to banish hunger and to do away with malnutrition, if we will only apply those resources and those energies.

The bill that I have asked you to be here with me when I sign puts some of that abundance into the reach of the people of America.

Under the Food Stamp Program a low-income family can take what little money it has for food and purchase food stamps. At the neighborhood grocery these are worth more than they cost. The difference is made up by the Federal Government.

Food Stamps are not the only weapon in the assault on hunger. The Food Stamp Act was passed three years ago. In that time, the program has expanded from 43 pilot areas in 23 States to 838 areas in 41 States. Today it is helping to feed nearly 2 million needy Americans. This extension will enable us to do still more.

We have nearly 20 million school children—more than ever before—receiving low cost or free meals under the School Lunch Program today in its 21st year.

More than 100,000 children have a better chance to learn because they began their day with a decent breakfast because of the Child Nutrition Act that we passed in 1966.

Three-million needy Americans in family units are receiving better diets in the Commodity Donation Program of the Department of Agriculture.

As I sign this Act, I am asking the Secretary to help America's 300 poorest counties which do not now have food assistance to start a Community Distribution Program to be available for the low-income families.

We are all mindful that the poor need more than food. The causes of poverty are complex. The answers to poverty are very difficult. The escape from poverty is not going to come soon, but we must all continue to try the best way that we can to give all that we can to banish poverty from our land.

Poverty's cruelest wound is hunger. The Act that we will sign today, I think, will do some little something to relieve some of that hunger.

To those men and women in the House and Senate who have had the vision to help us prepare this bill by the long drawn out hearings and the days in conference, and the debates on the floor, we owe them all a debt of gratitude which I want to acknowledge on behalf of the American people.

This will help our poor. This will help our farmers. And even though this is a bipartisan group, I hope it will help our Congress.

"I AM IN THE RIGHT PLACE AT THE RIGHT TIME"—LT. THOMAS F. REGAN

MR. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from Lt. Thomas F. Regan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MR. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week a requiem mass was offered in St. Anthony's Church, Falls Church, Va., for 1st Lt. Thomas F. Regan, 23, of 3812 Foxwood Nook, Falls Church, who died in Vietnam on September 18, 1967. As a member of the same parish and as an acquaintance of his family, Lieutenant Regan's heroic death brought Vietnam closer home.

About a month after Lieutenant Regan's arrival in Vietnam, he wrote to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Regan. He wanted them to know the reasons he volunteered for service in Vietnam.

If anything happens to me, I want you to know that I am over here voluntarily—

He wrote—

I want to be here and I know exactly why I want to be here.

Mr. and Mrs. Regan have made the letter from their son available to the press and it was featured in Sunday's Washington Post.

I think every American should read it.

Under unanimous consent, I herewith submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

I AM IN THE RIGHT PLACE AT THE RIGHT TIME

(NOTE.—The accompanying letter was written by 1st Lt. Thomas F. Regan, 23, of 3812 Foxwood Nook, Falls Church, about a month after he arrived in Vietnam last May. On Sept. 18 he was drowned when he and seven other Marines were caught in the swollen Camlo River. He died trying to help the others, according to a letter from his commanding officer to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Regan.)

(Lt. Regan was a graduate of the Marine Platoon Leader Training Program at Quantico and served as a forward artillery observer. He also was a sociology graduate of Wheeling (W. Va.) College in June, 1966, and had worked for several summers with retarded children.)

(His brother Michael, 26, served ten months in Vietnam as an Army first lieutenant. He also leaves a 19-year-old sister, Mary. His father is a lawyer in the General Counsel's Office of the General Services Administration.)

DEAR FAMILY: Another short letter to let you know that everything is O.K. with me.

In a couple of days we are going out on a company-size operation where we have been before. We made no contact in this particular area before but hope to have better luck this time. Even if we don't find anything, we are still making it difficult for the NVAs to mass together, and this is one of the main reasons why they aren't making any great military progress (or any other, that matter).

In one section of The Post that you sent me, there was an article which said that this war may be unwinnable. This is true of any war if you let it be. I am not too sure of the feelings of the people in the States, but there is no doubt in my mind—and I think the same applies to Ho Chi Minh—that we are winning.

Our progress is slow but positive. The enemy's is sliding and negative. To be more specific, we are beating them clearly militarily and, most important, we are winning the people. The NVAs are losing this most important part of the war. Proof of this is their resort to violence and terror to control the people. This can do nothing but alienate the people.

In this part of the war, our progress is very slow because we just don't have the troops to protect all the people and chase after the NVA. But gradually we are winning this because we can give the people a better way of life—one free of the fear of having the village leaders killed, the males impressed into servitude and an unfair amount of their rice taken away.

This "revolution" is not a popular one with the South Vietnamese. Many have been forced into it. Don't be fooled for a minute by those who say we are interfering with the Vietnamese people's right to self-determination. We are interfering with a minority's option to do this, but that same minority is interfering with the majority's right not to choose a life offered by Ho.

The only thing I am really worried about is the fact that some people are becoming annoyed at our slow progress and that American support for this effort may dwindle as time goes on. I think that this is Ho Chi Minh's big hope. Is our country suddenly going to find the price too high to pay for the ideal that we pledged to support before it started actually affecting us?

If anyone ever asks you why Americans should fight over here when it's not really affecting America, tell them that our country pledged its support to the cause of a free South Vietnamese people. This was given the approval of Congress, the representatives of the people. If the people didn't want this to happen, they could have said so then. It's easier to say "Why let Americans die over there now?" than it was to say then, "No, we won't pledge American support for the Vietnamese people because it may cost us too much."

I don't mind honest protest by individuals with unselfish motives, but the selfishness expressed in a lot of newspapers and magazines by "respectable" people bothers me. It can poison the minds of others.

I know that there is nothing black or white that can really be said about this, but we should keep in mind that this is supposed to be for the Vietnamese people. My reason for being here is not to protect America from some future war because the rest of the world has fallen to communism. I have no great fear of this. My reason for being here is so the Vietnamese people can live with freedom—the kind we have in America.

If anything should happen to me, I want you to know that I am over here voluntarily. I want to be here and I know exactly why I want to be here. I feel that it would not be a waste or tragedy if anything happened to me.

I think that this cause is as worthy as any that we have fought for. We knew that Hitler was wrong and was butchering the Jews but we didn't enter World War II until we got hit at Pearl Harbor—until it threatened us. Over here, we have not that much to gain for ourselves but we can do so much for the Vietnamese.

I don't particularly enjoy my work here, but neither does the guy who collects trash in the morning. Both jobs are necessary and the trashman can take pride in his job as I do in mine.

I guess I got a little carried away in telling you why I am here and my views about this. I didn't want there to be any doubt in your mind.

I know that from reading the papers and listening to the radio and watching TV, you can get very confused about this war because so many different things are said and be-

cause a lot of it doesn't seem to tie in together. I don't expect this letter to help any of you to understand all the different things said about this war but I hope it gives you as clear a picture as possible of why I am here.

If anyone asks you about why I am here or tries to tell you that I just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time and it's all very unfortunate, show them this letter and tell them that I think I am in the right place at the right time and want to be here.

Well, so long for now, and pray that I do my best.

Love,

TOM.

FIRST LADY ADDRESSES WILLIAMS COLLEGE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, during this past weekend we in western Massachusetts were highly honored and privileged to have as our guest the Nation's First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. The warmth and graciousness of Mrs. Johnson are so striking and so natural that no one can fail to be overwhelmed by her; and this was just the reaction which occurred throughout my congressional district.

Everyone is aware of Mrs. Johnson's outstanding efforts on behalf of beautification, and of conservation of our natural resources. She has done more than anyone else in this country to bring these basic but vital matters to the forefront of public awareness.

In my First Congressional District of Massachusetts, Mrs. Johnson's magnificent programs are especially meaningful and appreciated. For we are fortunate enough to be blessed with landscape and scenery and natural beauty that cannot be matched anywhere in the United States. At no time, furthermore, can this splendor be more vividly observed than during the present fall season with the appearance of nature's autumn leaves.

It was truly fitting, therefore, for Williams College at Williamstown, Mass., to confer an honorary degree upon Mrs. Johnson at its fall convocation this past Sunday in recognition of her beautification efforts.

The First Lady, in accepting her honorary degree, addressed the fall convocation about the environmental crisis that we now face. Her critical message was one that should be heard not just by those who gathered at Williamstown but by everyone in this land. I have, therefore, obtained unanimous consent to have her speech inserted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Along with this speech, I am also inserting in the RECORD an excellent editorial concerning Mrs. Johnson's visit which appeared in the North Adams Transcript.

I do not want to go into an in-depth discussion at this time concerning the

unfortunate incidents which occurred during the ceremonies at Williams. I would like to make clear, however, my firm belief that under no circumstances can it ever be considered to be proper to voice objections to the policies of the President of the United States by insulting and being rude to the First Lady of this Nation. I am in full agreement with the sentiments expressed by the editorial which follows Mrs. Johnson's speech in the RECORD.

REMARKS OF MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT WILLIAMS COLLEGE, WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS.

President Sawyer, friends, I will always treasure this degree that you have given me. It is thrilling to stand among you today and salute the Center for Environmental Studies and Planning whose promise is as fresh as tomorrow. For a college of this calibre to take such a step is an event which I applaud with all my heart.

It does not come too soon. Almost everyone agrees that we have reached an environmental crisis. And symptoms of the crisis abound—polluted streams, industrial slums, ghettos, littered roads.

But we should remember, perhaps, that our word "crisis" comes from the Greek word for *decision*. A time of difficulty calls for decisions—and this time calls on us to choose:

- between apathy and action in cities;
- between ugliness and beauty in the environment;
- between escape and involvement for the individual.

We are talking about more than "beautification". We are talking, really, about one of the most fateful questions of the time: whether the physical setting of American life will be pleasant or squalid.

If that question is not given a lively and enlightened answer, all our other efforts could be in vain.

Everything I read and see convinces me the Nation is geared for action to attack the problems that abound.

A front page story in the Wall Street Journal reports that amenity of towns is a crucial factor in deciding where factories locate. The magazines you pick are apt to have an ad showing a trout rising from crystal clear waters, with the caption, "This water could come out of your town's treatment plant."

The morning newspaper brings more and more cartoons poking fun at billboards, tree cutters, and yes, sometimes tree planters. Even our laughter shows our awareness.

The parade of mayors and city planners through Washington reveals they are scouting not only for funds, but for style and direction for their communities.

The question in America now is, whether the skill and talent and know-how is rising to fulfill the desire. We have learned that we cannot protect and enhance the beauty of this Nation solely through federal action, or just through citizens groups, or simply through academic institutions. All of these are necessary, plus a strong national will. Today, the crying need is for a partnership of thinking, planning, and action on the part of all groups.

Enhancement of our natural beauty requires and deserves more than a sentimental urge, important though it is. It calls for hard analysis, imaginative planning, political action—hard day-to-day efforts to translate our dreams into realities.

If there is to be a meeting of minds between the professor and the mayor, between the architect and the budget officer, between the scientist and the artist, what better place than here, "far from the maddening crowds," where people can think through their long-range visions?

Williams College can become the well-spring of fresh solutions to the problems of

our environment. One alert must be sounded, however, and that is, the need for constantly relating theory to practice, concept to application. There is no time for annotated studies to gather dust on the library shelves. The other day, I read that while 11,000 city planning positions must be filled in the next five years, planning schools are producing only 450 graduates a year.

This morning, as I flew out of the city and over these magnificent Berkshires, their foliage reaching like torches to the sky, my mind turned back over the history of how settlements evolved in our country, how we first wrested a beachhead on the Atlantic shores; later drove deep into the frontier with forts of protection; how patterns of settlement enlarged as people and goods swept westward. Centers of commerce in the eighteenth century became industrial beehives in the nineteenth.

Today, our minds throb with the vocabulary of megalopolis, the metropolitan agglomeration, with its core city, its inner freeway, its outer beltway, and its mile upon mile of suburban fringe. If the mass volume of the city shocks us, it can also spur us to action. How strange that after 5,000 years of building cities, we should at last rediscover the most obvious purpose of all—which the Athenians knew so well—the creation of a pleasant place to live.

There are more than 300 new towns in various stages of planning or development in the United States, and there are many rural regions, like this one in Berkshire County, searching for a harmonious growth pattern.

The President has recently announced that a 350-acre site in the Nation's Capital, no longer needed as a training school for boys, will become a model inner city community. There will be a welcome opportunity for creative new ideas about city living to show their merit.

I hope these new opportunities for study and application will be high on your agenda. Because the Nation needs thoughtful work that will approach the 20th Century man-and-nature equation as a science, and—hopefully, conclude it as an art.

I envy those of you who will be part of this Center. I hope that you will feed out to the Nation new thought, new ways for 350 million people to live according to their aspirations.

Each of you students will return to your home in Houston and Helena and Haverhill. Once more I want to repeat that what I hope you will do is to take all you have learned and put it to work at home where in the coming decades these problems will be attacked with varying degrees of skill, and dedication, and know-how, and also—in varying degrees—solved!

[From the North Adams Transcript, Oct. 6, 1967]

WELCOME, MRS. JOHNSON

The conservation of the nation's natural resources and the beautification of the countryside and the cities, to halt the spreading ugliness that is robbing the land of a priceless possession, are programs that deserve the whole-hearted support of every American.

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson should be commended for the leadership she has assumed in trying to arouse the nation to the need for such projects.

And Williams College should be applauded for its decision to confer an honorary degree upon the First Lady at the annual Fall Convocation on Sunday—and should feel honored itself that Mrs. Johnson has consented to take time from what must be a busy schedule to come to Williamstown to receive the degree.

At the same time, it is deplorable that some members of the Williams faculty should be guilty of such atrociously bad manners in

one case and such poor judgment in the other as to mar her visit.

Prof. Frederick L. Schuman's letter disassociating himself from the convocation can be described as ridiculous at best, and crude to the point of being appalling at worst.

The suggestion that the convocation "is clearly a glorification of the Johnson administration" is absurd and defies all logic. Mrs. Johnson is not being honored at Williams because, as Prof. Schuman said, she symbolizes the Johnson administration and its policy in Vietnam. She has been chosen for the honorary degree in recognition of her placing her prestige as First Lady in the forefront of the beautification program that some day might bring rich rewards to this nation.

And when Prof. Schuman seized upon the occasion of Mrs. Johnson's visit to call her husband names, he forfeited any claim to serious attention.

As for the three faculty members who have drafted a letter that they propose to present privately to Mrs. Johnson expressing their opposition to the Vietnam war, their motives may be reasonable enough but their judgment is questionable.

There are ample means available and many channels open for informing the President how people feel about the Vietnam war. Using the occasion of his wife's visit to a college campus for a purpose that has nothing whatever to do with the war—or with administration policy, for that matter—is not one of them.

They could send, or take, their protest to Washington, and would have a perfect right to do so. But to take advantage of Mrs. Johnson's presence at Williams for an entirely unrelated purpose to dramatize their opposition, however, mildly, is misguided zeal.

Mrs. Johnson has said "An unforgettable thing is to go to New England in the autumn and fly over those gold and crimson and scarlet hills and valleys, dotted with lakes and enough green in it to serve as a foil."

It is that sort of thing that Mrs. Johnson is hoping to preserve by awakening people to the need for the beautification and conservation program. That is why she is being honored Sunday at Williams. Most of those at Williams and in the Northern Berkshire area will accord her a gracious welcome.

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in a special editorial, Alan C. McIntosh, of the Rock County, Minn., Star-Herald, calls National Newspaper Week "one more milestone in the never-ending battle between those who would suppress the truth and the newspapers." Mr. McIntosh brings home in a magnificent way the many obligations citizens owe to the courageous free press of America, and it is a pleasure to introduce his editorial for the RECORD as we observe National Newspaper Week, October 8-14.

FREEDOM . . . PARADISE LOST

(By Alan C. McIntosh)

For several years we had a small picture of a newspaper printed on the envelopes in which we sent out the Star-Heralds to out-of-town subscribers.

A picture of a newspaper which bore these words as the headline: "Heritage of Truth, Frontier of Freedom"; "A Free Press Is Essential to an Informed People."

Eventually an overzealous postal department employee, who knew his Postal Laws and Regulations book better than his Bible, noticed one of our envelopes.

It wasn't long till we received an order to cease and desist using that picture and slogan . . . a violation of the "rules".

The fact that we had just received an order of 24,000 of these envelopes didn't make a bit of difference to the bureaucrat. It looked like we were stuck.

However, a cooler, wiser, head higher up realized the waste. He ruled that we could use our supply of envelopes if we would deface that offending cut. So we "defaced" 24,000 envelopes.

Silly? Yes. But not half as silly and not one-hundredth as frightening as some of the things that happen just because people resent newspapers probing for the truth and the facts.

This is National Newspaper Week. It's one more milestone in the never-ending battle between those who would suppress the truth and the newspapers.

It is hard to believe the workings of the minds of the "Little Caesars" who believe they, and they only, should have the right to say what is "news".

For instance—the public officials high up in the Pentagon who put a rigid "classified" taboo on the publication of the amount of peanut butter purchases by our armed forces.

The genius figured that if our potential enemy ever found out how much peanut butter we were buying he could figure out how many men we had in our armed forces. Ridiculous when you remember that while they were clamping down on peanut butter figures the same Pentagon was releasing monthly the total numbers of our men in the armed forces.

The passion for secrecy never dies.

Write the Department of Defense and ask if it is true or false that General Custer had a feminine companion with him at the Battle of the Big Horn. See what kind of an answer you get.

Few people realize it, but our would-be "Little Caesars" still keep a vast amount of Civil War information as "classified".

An American author had done a biography on a Civil War General. He wanted some additional facts and information to up-date his book. He asked for that information from the Pentagon and found that it was still, after 100 years, withheld from the public as being "classified."

These things could be laughable if they weren't so tragic.

But they are symptomatic of the never-ending battle that has to be waged against those who would muzzle America's free newspapers.

Too many people know too little about what "Freedom of the Press" really means. They think it must mean some extra privilege for newspapers only.

"Freedom of the Press" in National Newspaper Week, and every other week, means that your newspaper is your "stand in" in the protection of the freedoms guaranteed to you by our Constitution.

Freedom of the Press belongs to the citizenry . . . not to the newspapers or publishers. We are merely the citizenry's trustees in protecting these precious freedoms.

It is left for the newspaperman to walk the lonely road. Long ago, when he took the vows of journalism, he renounced any dream of being his community's most beloved citizen. He knows that if he ever won that title he would have failed as a newspaperman. He's damned if he does and damned if he doesn't . . . but because he is a newspaperman, he is willing to pay the price in order to fulfill his obligation to print the truth—and the news.

Not all the "bad guys" ride "black horses." They aren't so easy to identify. The fellow who wants an item left out may be the man

who you thought was your best friend. But the printing of that story may cost you his friendship.

To print a story about controversial events or write a hard hitting editorial may cost a newspaper heavily in revenue.

The public official who chafes visibly and audibly because the press shows up at a meeting is only typical of the thousands of "Little Caesars" who have a contempt for the ability of John Q. Citizen, to think for himself. They think that "they" should decide what should be called news. There are so many public officials today who can't understand why the press won't willingly and amiably agree to "managed news" instead of painfully digging for the facts—and the truth.

We have seen the lights of freedom wink out in many countries. And, as soon as the lights went out, the next step was to muzzle the press. Any dictator or would-be dictator fears one newspaper reporter's typewriter more than he does a machine-gun company.

What the "Little Caesars" in America forget, and where they make their fatal mistake, is their under-estimation of Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public. They forget that Americans are not horses.

A horse has to be blindfolded in order that he can be led from a burning stable to safety.

Americans don't like blindfolds and they don't like people who try to blindfold them. Horses panic in the face of danger. An American panics only when he can't see what is ahead of him. He can face up to any disaster or meet any blood chilling challenge if he knows the truth and the facts.

As we observe National Newspaper Week, let us remember that "Freedom of the Press" doesn't mean special privilege for newspapers.

It is an obligation they gladly accept and carry—an obligation to help keep America free.

GOVERNOR LEVANDER DESCRIBES ORGANIZATIONAL STREAMLINING IN MINNESOTA

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Harold LeVander, Governor of the State of Minnesota, recently addressed the Midwestern Governor's Conference on various organizational ways our State is moving to meet urban and local problems.

In order to meet these urgent problems, the Governor points out:

We cannot neglect the equally pressing problem of getting State Government organized and equipped to better assume its urban responsibilities.

I know those with responsibility for more effective government will find Minnesota's progress report helpful. I am, therefore, pleased to place in the RECORD the complete text of Governor LeVander's address at this point in my remarks:

GOV. HAROLD LEVANDER, MIDWESTERN GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE SESSION ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AUGUST 29, 1967

Much has been said at this conference about the need for more jobs for the disadvantaged calling for a full spectrum of opportunity programs for job training and the creation of job opportunities, both by pri-

vate enterprise and public incentives. I would agree that these problems must be faced today, but we cannot neglect the equally pressing problem of getting state government organized and equipped to better assume its urban responsibilities.

State government is the source of local government authority, organization and finances. It is the administrator of most social programs and conducts many physical development activities, such as highways and open space. Because of these factors, state government is in the key strategic position to make our governmental system more workable and more able to deal with problems comprehensively. The Federal Government, basically, can only give incentives to State and local government to accomplish national goals, whereas State government has the responsibility and authority to change the structure and ground rules directly to make the system work better, and to unify and rationalize the roles of each unit of government.

I am pleased to report that in Minnesota the Governor has been given sweeping authority and responsibility for a frontal attack upon our urban development problems as a result of united action by the legislature and local government officials.

A Twin Cities metropolitan council, appointed by the Governor, has been created by the legislature, with the chief executive serving at the pleasure of the Governor. This council has the responsibility of coordinating metropolitan development through the employment of carefully selected powers to suspend projects and plans of special districts conducting such region-shaping programs as sewage systems, parks, and airports—with mediation powers between municipalities in regard to local government actions of area-wide concern, and with review powers on Federal programs. Traditional metropolitan planning is superseded with a broad charge to search deeply into the social, economic and physical development problems and opportunities of the region.

The State legislature has also given the Governor direct responsibility for comprehensive State planning and the harmonizing of the plans and programs of State agencies with local and regional government. This charge gives the Governor substantial authority to coordinate social programs and region-shaping State action.

The legislature has also created, under the Governor's direction within the State planning agency, an office of local and urban affairs to help coordinate State and local programs, to give technical assistance to local government, to study and conduct research into local and urban problems, to analyze municipal boundaries, and to assist local governments in utilizing State and Federal aid programs.

In corollary action, the legislature, at my request:

Strengthened the water and air pollution control agency and placed it under the direct supervision of the Governor;

Consolidated fragmented civil rights agencies into a strong department of human relations responsible to the Governor;

Expanded fair housing laws to privately financed dwellings;

Established mandatory training for law enforcement officers in local government; and

Established a metropolitan transit commission, with the chairman responsible to the Governor.

Through coordinated application of these tools we will try to bring order and advancement of individual opportunity in the urban scene.

It is obvious that fragmented programs and overlapping government is not solving the problems of urban America. State action is essential if we are to meet today's problems.

We, in Minnesota, are acting.

IS THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION PLANNING TO USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN VIETNAM?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the Congress and the public I have taken the necessary action to obtain unanimous consent for the reproduction below of my communication of this date to the House Republican conference discussing the question "Is the Johnson administration planning to use nuclear weapons in Vietnam?"

OCTOBER 9, 1967.

From: Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Chairman, Conference Committee on Nuclear Affairs.

To: House Republican Conference.

Subject: Is the Johnson administration planning to use nuclear weapons in Vietnam?

During the 1964 Presidential campaign vast charges of atomic irresponsibility were leveled against Candidate Barry Goldwater. Johnson Administration campaigners vilified him as a "Nuclear Nut" for views which basically: (1) endorsed development of "clean" neutron bombs; (2) envisaged an ABM defense system; and, (3) did not reject the possibility of using atomic land mines for defense against invasions of allied territory.

Subsequently the Johnson Administration has not denied that our weapons laboratories are working on the neutron bomb problem. Its deployment of an ABM system recently was announced by Secretary McNamara with the assertion that it is not a "provocative" move. It is considering with apparent favor the matter of nuclear land mines.

Just a few days ago, at the latest NATO nuclear planning meeting in Ankara, Turkish Defense Minister Ahmet Popaloglu suggested atomic mines be seeded along Turkey's frontier with the Soviet Union. The idea is to create an atomic barrier along the Turkish-Soviet boundary to thwart Soviet invasion. On his return from the meeting last Monday news dispatches quoted Mr. McNamara as stating, regarding the Popaloglu proposal:

"Of course, that could not be considered provocative because these atomic demolition charges are placed in the ground—under the ground along the border—and could be used only for defense and not for offensive purposes."

So, the Johnson Administration nuclear attitudes have switched to the Goldwater position on each of its three facets. In context of the Administration's previous violent objections, great uncertainty is aroused as to just what its current thinking is on the application of these attitudes to specific defense problems of deep and primary public concern.

For instance: Is the Johnson Administration planning to use nuclear weapons in Vietnam? If it is, or if it is not, much concerns the Nation and the Administration ought to say something about it.

If nuclear land mines are not deemed provocative to the Soviets right on their own border with Turkey, why should they be provocative along the Demilitarized Zone of Viet Nam through which North Vietnamese are actually invading at such a high cost to U.S. Marine Corps defenders? If the mines

are deemed effective against potential Soviet invaders, why should they not be deemed equally effective against actual North Vietnamese invaders? The Administration's moves and pronouncements raise these questions and they ought to be answered one way or the other.

Nuclear land mines below the DMZ stretching all along it might be buried deep enough to trap fission products beneath the surface and avoid radiological hazards. Triggering the explosives might be left to the invaders by devices which their presence activates—so that the decision to fire the nuclear devices—and the responsibility therefor—would rest on them, not us. They would not be fired if the North refrained from hostile invasion. They would be fired if it failed to refrain. By the process, the objective of clearing an exposed area just below the DMZ would be accomplished quickly and at modest monetary cost.

Is this the next logical step in Johnson Administration's shifting nuclear attitudes and changing nuclear applications?

What has evolved from 1964 to date gives reason to believe so. Thus it also gives reason for the Administration to speak out at an appropriate time consistent with military planning and security.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a number of articles have been written in the past year or so which tend to sensationalize certain aspects of radioactive waste disposal. A great deal of effort has gone into research and development on safe methods for handling such wastes, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has spent hundreds of hours in hearings on this subject. The progress has been impressive, and the record of safety in the atomic energy industry is a remarkably good one.

This is not to say that there is no potential danger. Members of the joint committee, of which I am ranking minority member, are very aware of this potential danger. This is why we have strongly supported research and development work in this field. The joint committee considers it extremely important to maintain the emphasis on safety in the nuclear industry, so that the outstanding record of this industry may continue.

In order to place the radioactive waste disposal picture in proper perspective, I personally prepared and am sending a response to a series of critical articles written by Mr. Ralph de Toledano. I think the information I provided him helps to focus on the pertinent facts. If there is no objection, I would like to have my letter to Mr. De Toledano included in the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
Washington, D.C., October 5, 1967.

Mr. RALPH DE TOLEDANO,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RALPH: Your letter of September 18 transmitting three more articles on the AEC

requested some "specifics." I have some now, and would have written sooner, but I've been away from my desk about 10 days.

I think it may be appropriate to start with your earlier article entitled: "The AEC's Gift to America: Radioactive Waste." Some of the questions you raise therein are similar to questions in your three most recent articles. Since the publication of your earlier article, the Joint Committee staff has been pulling together some material intended to help clarify the record. Six specific items are covered in some depth in attachment 1, and are keyed to quotes from your earlier article.

I would like to treat the first item directly, to wit, your comment that "... Americans are being led down the garden path to national radioactive poisoning."

Occasionally we hear from interested citizens who are highly critical of the nuclear waste handling procedures in this country. Such individuals sometimes accuse the Atomic Energy Commission and the nuclear industry of withholding the facts. To the contrary, it appears that usually these individuals have not taken the trouble to learn the facts from the great quantity of information dealing with this subject which is in the public record.

The extensive public record on this subject includes:

(1) The comprehensive hearings by the JCAE in 1959, reported in 5 volumes, 3142 pages, which have been updated in subsequent hearings since then (see attachment 1; Bibliography of JCAE waste disposal hearings).

(2) The detailed regulatory proceedings on each licensed power reactor, available in the Commission's Public Document Room.

(3) The extensive reports on the results of environmental studies in the vicinity of AEC-owned plants and laboratories which have been issued by the AEC and the Public Health Service.

(4) A great deal of other information available to the public in the form of technical articles and speeches. See item 6, attachment 2, for some examples.

If you are looking for assessments of the radioactive waste question which have been made outside the AEC, I can mention at least three.

A. The National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council Publication 1400, "Waste Management and Control" (1966), summarizes radioactivity control in these words on page 199:

"Radioactive wastes are a potential source of ground pollution. However, they are not thought to constitute a problem requiring new abatement studies at the present time. The quantity of wastes is small and the quality of disposal is high. A variety of special techniques is used to confine the wastes and keep them out of circulating ground water for geologic periods of time. Wastes from nuclear power generation are certain to increase in future years, but disposal of these, using existing techniques, does not appear to present a serious problem."

B. In a report to the Secretary of HEW, the Task Force on Environmental Health and Related Problems submitted in June 1967 its recommendations under the title: "A Strategy for a Livable Environment." From hundreds of possible goals, the Task Force selected 10 that are worthy of high priority. One of these, Goal No. 8, has to do with radiation. The bulk of the Task Force's concern appears to be related to the need for refining standards governing the public's exposure to dental and medical X-rays, a subject which I am equally certain will continue to get attention and action. A general reference in the report to adequate safeguards to protect against any hazards arising out of new applications of nuclear power and nuclear radiations should be interpreted as a proper acknowledgement that the safeguards experts, the health physicists and the

ecologists must continue to do their homework. We generally accept a responsibility to continue doing our homework as we progress in any area. There is no indication, however, that the safeguards homework in this area is lagging to the extent that all progress in nuclear developments should stop while we catch up on the homework.

C. The report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment," published by the White House in November 1965, contains 22 pages of recommendations. No recommendation mentions radioactivity. Conversely, on page 14, in a discussion of varying degrees of Federal authority to act on pollution, the report states "With some pollutants such as radionuclides, extreme caution is exercised to assure that unwanted effects in the environment will be prevented."

I could comment further on the extent to which the AEC and industry go to make such information available to the public, but item 6 in attachment 2 covers that pretty well.

On your three recent articles, I can only hit some of the highlights, and try to provide some detail later. You cover a great many issues in several broad strokes of your pen.

In the first place, you must be aware that the Joint Committee has never touted nuclear energy as the panacea for all our problems. But anyone entertaining the thought that it doesn't play a vital role in the near future has not examined the energy needs of this nation, or the world. We will soon need to exploit all sources of energy to meet our growing requirements. Our energy utilization is now doubling every 10 years or less. Note the confirmation of the need for nuclear power in the comprehensive report to the President in 1964—"Energy R & D & National Progress."

Similarly, perspective on radiological hazards can only be gained by careful comparison with progress in other areas toward meeting man's requirements for survival. Certainly radioactivity is dangerous if improperly handled, but do I need to mention countless other necessities of our civilization which are similarly dangerous—when handled improperly? There is no basis for perpetuating an unreasonable fear of radiation. One of the reasons we are spending a goodly sum on R&D is to make sure we know how to handle it properly. We are learning how and the record of safety is a remarkably good one.

You want specifics, and rightly so. But there are many general principles that cannot be ignored. For instance, in drawing comparisons between areas having numerous variables, the right parameters have to be compared. Thus, when one talks of the money going into nuclear development now, it means less to compare that amount of money with another item in the budget than it does to talk of the ultimate return on the investment.

For nuclear power it is countless billions of dollars in return to the taxpayers in the form of reduced power rates—or power rates which have remained stable rather than being boosted.

Similarly, if one talks about 5 million gallons of waste, one should know that a large percentage of the 5 million gallons represents harmless diluents which are added to the small percentage of radioactive material to bring down the radioactivity of the entire volume to permissible harmless levels. Put another way, did the dumping result in exceeding the permissible tolerance levels? There is a big difference between high level waste and low level waste, in any kind of waste category you wish to discuss.

Similarly, we all know about the impropriety of quoting someone out of context. Dr. Kavanagh's quote that the AEC is still "looking for a permanent method of dis-

posal" for high level waste, doesn't mean there isn't a method. It means that investigations are still under way to find the safest, most economical method. Read references V and VI (attachment 2) if you wish consultation or confirmation on this.

Congressman Hollifield is often quoted out of context, perhaps because he has the courage to enter into debate on so many controversial subjects. But to quote him in connection with a reference to the uranium miner deaths as saying merely "Maudlin sentimentality," is grossly unfair. Facts were being debated, and lacking facts the hearing witness did retreat in the fashion implied.

While on the subject of the uranium miner hearings, I will only say that the complete record will be published shortly. Anyone who reviews it carefully can sort out the facts. The original death statistics I believe were erroneous. I dare say Mr. Boyle's prediction of 6,000 is far off the target. I could go to great length trying to bring the hazards of the overall mining industry as well as other industries into perspective for you, but the hearings record will serve that purpose. For perspective, note the attached article—the most recent of many such articles to cross my desk—read the high rate of cancer noted among smokers in the asbestos industry.

On the closing down of reactors, this was normal and to be expected. There have been a few premature entries into the reactor construction phase. It was necessary to build them to determine technology and economics. As we have gained this experience and information the tendency in that direction has disappeared. Not all that investment was lost by any means. But again the enormity of the undertaking has to be considered along with the potential return on the investment. Trial and error methodology—except when safety is involved—is a necessary and accepted part of the development process.

You have to recall that some years back there were a number of attractive reactor concepts, on paper. The only way to really find out their relative promise was to perform reactor experiments. This kind of thing can't be done in a laboratory. So the reactors you refer to were really experiments from which we have learned a great deal. We knew it was a horse race between several reactor concepts, but it was a race that had to be run and it had its payoff. Among the many possible choices of materials, coolants and fuels, we now know pretty well how they compare in terms of performance, safety and economics. We still have a ways to go, but the first generation of power producers has come into the foreground in the form of the boiling water and pressurized water reactors. We still have a good bit to learn on the comparative standings among the advanced converters, including whether we really need them, or can we jump directly to the breeders?

I will endeavor to get some details for you on any substantive questions in your three most recent articles you may specify. I would hope that you might wish to give your readers a balanced outlook on emerging peaceful nuclear technologies which are destined by necessity to play a very large role in satisfying man's ever-increasing demands for energy.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Industrial radioactive waste disposal hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and Special Subcommittee on Radiation)

I. 1959—"Hearings on Industrial Radioactive Waste Disposal" (Subcommittee on Radiation, Jan. 28-30, Feb. 2-3).

Vol. 1: Origin and nature of wastes evolved from nuclear energy activities, and operations to manage these wastes at AEC and other installations. (1966 p)

Vol. 2: Treatment and Disposal of low and intermediate wastes to atmosphere, surface waterways, and the ground. (837 p)

Vol. 3: Handling, treatment and proposed ultimate disposal of high level wastes; future estimates and economics of disposal. (685 p)

Vol. 4: Activities of Federal and State agencies in effluent control; interagency relationships and international aspects. (549 p)

Vol. 5: July 29, 1959; disposal of low level wastes into ocean. (85 p)

II. 1963—"202" Hearings: "Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry"; updating all matters related to waste disposal. (41 pages of 1,042 pages in 2 Vols.)

III. 1959-1957—Virtually all of the annual authorization hearings and "202" hearings have elicited testimony and documentation for the record which contributed to the continual up-dating of the 1959 special hearings which still constitute the bible on the subject of radioactive waste disposal.

IV. 1959-1967—Special subjects, such as the mill tailings problem and related concerns over stream pollution, radon gas and blowing dust; the Hanford stream pollution; question; and cancer incidence in uranium miners; are all documented by voluminous JCAE files of correspondence and meeting records relating to JCAE coordination with the AEC, HEW (Public Health Service and Federal Water Pollution Control), and Federal Radiation Council. These reflect the close surveillance of the nature and resolution of such problems by the JCAE and its subcommittees, such as Mr. Aspinall's on Raw Materials and Mr. Price's on Research, Development and Radiation.

STAFF COMMENTS ON DE TOLEDANO WASTE ARTICLE

1. Item: "Every one of these plants, in producing energy, also produces radioactive waste. Now there is no way of neutralizing that waste." (6th paragraph)

Comment: It is important to understand that radioactive materials that are released to the environment in effluents from routine atomic energy power plant operations involve very low concentrations of radioactivity. Essentially all of the potentially hazardous radioactive fission products are contained in the fuel elements, which are designed to retain them even under extreme conditions. After a certain operating period, the spent fuel elements are removed from the reactor and shipped intact to a fuel reprocessing plant for recovery of valuable uranium and plutonium. It is in this part of the nuclear fuel cycle where highly radioactive waste is produced. (See comment on item 3.) In connection with the handling and treatment of very low levels of radioactivity produced in atomic energy power plants, it is noted that from 7-10 years of satisfactory waste management operating experience has been obtained to date. Radioactivity concentrations in plant liquid effluents, prior to discharge into streams, have ranged from 1-5% of the permissible concentration in water for continuous use by individuals in the general population as recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection.

2. Item: "... the AEC—at taxpayers' expense—has been creating vast 'cemeteries' in various parts of the country. There is one near Hanford, Washington, and another near Buffalo, New York." (6th paragraph)

Comment: The implication that taxpayers are improperly being made to pay for private industry's radioactive waste burials undoubtedly derives from Malcolm Kildale's press release of April 27. Most of the solid radioactive waste buried at Hanford is from the AEC's own production operations at that site. The AEC also buries solid radioactive wastes from its own production, testing, and research operations at several of its other

sites. These costs are logically borne by the AEC itself.

Commercial services for the burial of solid radioactive waste are offered to the private nuclear industry as follows:

California Nuclear, Inc.—A site at Hanford near to but physically separated from, the AEC burial sites.

Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc.—West Valley, N.Y. (south of Buffalo).

Nuclear Engineering Co., Inc.—Near Morehead, Ky.

Nuclear Engineering Co., Inc.—Beatty, Nevada.

The cost of operating these commercial burial sites, including the costs of the environmental monitoring required by the licenses, are borne in full by the companies involved. In each case, the land is leased from the state government, and a fee per unit of volume of waste buried is paid to the state. This essentially creates a trust fund out of which the state may pay for continued environmental monitoring or other costs which might arise at some future time after expiration of the lease.

All of these commercial operations must be carried out only under an AEC or Agreement State specific license. The applicant for a license to operate a burial ground must demonstrate that the topographical, geological and hydrological characteristics of the site and the procedures which he proposes to follow are such that the operation will not in any way present a hazard to public health and safety.

3. Item: "But the radioactivity won't stay put. Buried in concrete canisters, sometimes only three feet deep, it seeps into the soil. Since these 'cemeteries' must be near running water—to prevent them from getting too 'hot'—the radioactivity affects plant and marine life." (7th paragraph)

Comment: This item reveals a number of misunderstandings of how radioactive waste is handled. Most of the radioactive waste in existence has been generated from the reprocessing of irradiated uranium reactor fuel. Almost all of this reprocessing waste is stored in underground steel tanks, rather than being buried in the soil. This storage is considered of an interim nature (several decades). The tanks are continually checked to assure that if any leaks develop they will be detected and appropriate corrective measures are taken. An extensive research and development program is being conducted by the AEC on ultimate disposal methods, such as conversion to solids and burial in salt mines or disposal in deep impermeable rock formations.

The solid wastes buried in soil are relatively small in radioactivity content, consisting of such items as contaminated scrap, laboratory equipment, defective piping, and used decontamination material. Very little of it is in "concrete canisters", nor are such canisters necessary. Cooling water is required by some of the tanks for high-level liquid waste, but no such cooling is required by the buried solid waste; in fact, extensive effort is applied to assuring that such burials are made in locations where underground or surface water streams will not encroach on the buried wastes.

The data from environmental monitoring programs carried out at the burial sites confirm that waste handling techniques both in the ATC programs and in the regulated private industry programs are adequate to assure that members of the public are not exposed to more than a small fraction of established radiation protection standards.

Following item No. 6, six references are listed. Reference I provides more description of these points. Reference II illustrates the extent of the information required by the AEC for review of license application for a commercial radioactive waste burial site. References III through VI are more technical but may serve to illustrate the degree of

emphasis placed by the AEC upon radioactive waste control and improvement.

4. Item: "Not too long ago, a radioactive whale was discovered off the Pacific coast. It had been feeding on plankton infected by Columbia River water—the water flowing past Hanford." (7th paragraph)

Comment: No date for discovery of the "hot whale" was provided in the original Kildale press release of April 20. The press release did indicate the whale had been examined by "scientists". On September 19, 1963, a fin whale was captured west of Depoe Bay, Oregon. Radionuclides in various tissues of the whale were analyzed by Charles Osterberg, William Pearce, and Norman Kujala, of the Department of Oceanography at Oregon State University, Corvallis.

These scientists reported their findings as a letter to the editor of the magazine "Nature". This weekly journal, published in England, has a worldwide circulation and reputation among scientists. The letter was published in the issue of December 5, 1964 (Volume 204, page 1006), and newspaper stories based upon it appeared in the New York Times of December 11 and the San Francisco Chronicle of December 13. Both of these newspaper stories correctly quoted the scientists as to the significance of their findings: "Levels are extremely low and no health hazard exists." If the Kildale news release is intended to describe the same whale, the omission of the scientists' findings is highly misleading.

The whale carcass was disposed of in the normal manner by a rendering plant, and it was not necessary to dispose of it as radioactive waste, as the Kildale press release implied. It should also be pointed out that the low concentrations of radioactivity mentioned in the scientific report represent short-lived radionuclides produced by irradiation of minerals in the river water used to cool the Hanford reactors. These radionuclides are not from reprocessing wastes or buried solid wastes.

5. Item: "The AEC, however, isn't telling the American people about this. Twenty years ago it discovered that radioactive waste was poisoning fish. So the AEC, in a report that is so secret even its title is classified, buried the facts..."

Comment: The titles of AEC classified reports must, by regulation, be themselves unclassified. The report in question is cited in Kildale's May 4 press release as "Radioactivity in various species of fish from the Columbia and Yakima Rivers", by K. E. Herde, dated 1947 and classified "Secret". Essentially all Hanford documents at that time were classified "Secret"; this particular one was declassified on September 29, 1960, and has been available to any one since then. The correct serial number of the Herde document is HEW 3-5501, indicating the 5501st document from the 300 Area at the Hanford Engineer Works. However, a request for HW 3-5501 would still produce the desired document. The Kildale press release erroneously lists it as HW-35501. The latter is the serial number of a document entitled "231 Bldg. Plutonium Nitrate Solution Data Sheets, Serial No. 962", dated February 25, 1955, by W. N. Mobley, which deals with classified plutonium production information. There is no connection between the subject matter of the two reports.

6. Item: "So far, the silence of the AEC and the companies concerned has been deafening."

Comment: The environmental monitoring activities of the AEC and its contractors, as well as the waste management activities, are summarized in periodic reports released to the press and available to the public through the various AEC public information offices. In addition, the data has been reported to the U.S. Public Health Service and, together with data gathered by that agency and by

various state and local health agencies, published in the monthly journal, "Radiological Health Data", available from the Government Printing Office.

As an example of the content of "Radiological Health Data", the issue of August 1964 contains an article on "Radiological Survey of the Lower Columbia River in Oregon, January 1962-July 1963", by George L. Toombs and John G. Bailey of the Oregon State Board of Health. (Note that this is the period ending shortly before the capture of the "hot whale"). The paragraph of this article titled "Conclusions" is quoted in its entirety:

"Concentrations of radionuclides arising from the Hanford reactors and atmospheric nuclear weapons testing were readily detected in the environmental media in the area covered by this survey. Certain trends were generally seen for fission product and activation product radionuclide concentrations. Zinc-65 and chromium-51 concentrations were observed to decrease with increasing distance by water from the Hanford reactors, and to remain relatively stable with respect to time. The fission product radionuclides, zirconium-niobium-95 and ruthenium-103 and 106, did not show a trend with respect to distance from the Hanford reactors. However, with respect to time, they did show a generalized peak during the spring of 1963, probably due to the heavy fallout accompanying the spring rains. All concentrations for the radionuclides reported were below those recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection for the general public. The radionuclide concentrations measured during this survey warrant no action other than continued surveillance to insure that the levels of radioactivity in this environment are neither too high nor increasing too rapidly."

Copies of all applications to the Commission to construct and operate a nuclear power reactor, chemical reprocessing plant, or commercial waste burial ground are furnished to state and local officials and are placed in the AEC's Public Document Room. Public announcements of the receipt of the application and the subsequent action taken thereon are issued by AEC and notices are published in the Federal Register.

Copies of all correspondence and filings relating to the application, license or amendment to the license, including waste handling procedures, are placed in the public records of the Commission, which are available to any member of the public at the Commission's Public Document Room located at 1717 H Street, Washington, D.C.

REFERENCES

- I. "Radioactive Wastes", Division of Technical Information, USAEC.
- II. "Licensing Requirements for Establishment of A Land Burial Facility for Burial of Radioactive Wastes".
- III. "Waste Disposal Into the Ground at Hanford", S. J. Beard and W. L. Godfrey, Isochem, Inc.
- IV. "Migration Characteristics of Radionuclides Through Sediments Underlying the Hanford Reservation", D. J. Brown, Isochem, Inc.
- V. "Disposal of High Level Solidified Wastes in Salt Mines", W. C. McClain, R. L. Bradshaw, and F. M. Empson, Oak Ridge National Laboratory.
- VI. "Solid Radioactive Waste Disposal at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory", John W. Enders, Health Division, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.

(Enclosures III through VI were presented at the International Atomic Energy Agency-European Nuclear Energy Authority Symposium on the Disposal of Radioactive Waste Into the Ground, Vienna, Austria, May 29-June 2, 1967)

CXIII—1775—Part 21

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 20, 1967]

HIGH RATE OF CANCER NOTED AMONG SMOKERS IN ASBESTOS INDUSTRY—COMBINATION OF ASBESTOS DUST, CIGARETTES POSES GREAT RISK OF LUNG CANCER, STUDY SHOWS

ATLANTIC CITY.—Asbestos workers who smoke cigarettes have a ninetyfold greater risk of dying of lung cancer than persons who neither smoke nor work around asbestos, three New York medical researchers said.

The extremely high risk of lung cancer among persons exposed to the combination of asbestos dust and cigaret smoke was uncovered in a study of 370 members of the Newark, N.J., and New York locals of the International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers union. The men are primarily involved in installing asbestos insulation in construction work.

The workers were exposed to a greater amount of asbestos dust than the general population, and all had been occupationally exposed to it for at least 20 years. But the researchers added that the general population, particularly in big-city areas, is exposed to a slight amount of such particles. As a result, they said, it is important to determine whether cigaret smoking makes this light exposure more hazardous than it would be otherwise.

In a report to the scientific session of the American Medical Association's annual convention here, the researchers said there were 94 deaths among the insulation workers during a 52-month period. This, they calculated, was 46 more than would have been expected among a similar group of men who hadn't been chronically exposed to asbestos.

Most of the men who died—78—were cigaret smokers. And among the smokers, 24 died of lung cancer. No lung-cancer deaths occurred among those who didn't smoke.

Twenty-four lung-cancer deaths was an extremely high rate, the researchers calculated. Among a similar group of smokers who hadn't been exposed to asbestos, statisticians would expect only about three deaths from lung cancer, they said.

"If they had neither smoked nor been exposed to asbestos dust," they said, the expected number of lung-cancer deaths would have been one or none during the 52-month period.

"All people incur a great increase in risk in lung cancer if they smoke cigarettes; for asbestos workers the increase in risk is tremendous," they said. The researchers noted that microscopic asbestos fibers, once inhaled, remain permanently in the lung tissues. As a result, "asbestos workers who don't smoke cigarettes should never begin. Those who do smoke should stop immediately."

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: ACTION NOW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, a good article on the growing length of congressional sessions appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on October 1.

In the event some of my colleagues may have missed it, I will have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article entitled "Should Congress Stay in Session 12 Months a Year?" by Allan C. Brownfield.

I would like to remind the House that

under title 4 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967—which passed the Senate overwhelmingly in March—Congress would be permitted to recess during the month of August if it had not completed its business by the statutory adjournment date of July 31 and provided that the country was not in a time of war or national emergency.

The August adjournment provision is only one of many needed improvements contained in the congressional reform bill passed by the Senate. While S. 355 is surely not the ultimate answer to modernization of the legislative branch, it is, on balance, a constructive and much-needed bill.

I urge the leadership to schedule this legislation as soon as possible for action by the House. Surely most of us must be aware that our workload problems are not going to diminish either in number or in complexity. Failure to take a few steps toward modernizing our procedures can only result in making the problems more difficult to handle.

The article follows:

SHOULD CONGRESS STAY IN SESSION 12 MONTHS A YEAR?

(By Allan C. Brownfield)

As members of Congress go deeper into the fall months, the nagging problem of when to adjourn and how to maintain a close and effective contact with the people back home remains.

Can Congress complete its work within the period of a traditional nine-month session, or is it necessary to rethink the length of time during which members should be at work?

Many senators and representatives have given thought to this subject, and a number of proposals have been discussed. Yet, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, which passed the Senate 75 to 9, has remained in the hands of the House Rules Committee for some time, with the apparent concurrence of the House Democratic leadership.

This bill does not discuss the specific question of the length of congressional sessions, but it does concern itself with other reform measures such as tightening the regulation of lobbyists, assuring minority staffing of committees, stripping Congress of its historic role in selection and confirmation of paymasters and revamping committee procedures. Included is a provision for a month-long vacation every August.

NEED FOR REFORM

Even the limited reforms suggested in the Reorganization Bill seem difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, the need for reform is felt by many members of Congress, and several have come to grips with the question of the length of congressional sessions.

The late President Kennedy once noted that "during the 19th century, America had many distinguished senators, presidents, congressmen . . . but most of those men dealt in their entire political life . . . with only four or five major problems. . . . Now the problems swarm across the desks of political leaders of this country."

The current Congress, far from being an exception, is added proof of this fact. We face turmoil in our cities, a war which seems to be stalemated, a program of welfare which has suddenly become unpopular, and a nation whose people seek some answer to their sense of crisis from their elected representatives. In the midst of such a situation, who can seriously think of adjournment? Who can doubt that Congress is headed toward almost permanent year-round sessions?

The fact that Congress desperately seeks

as early an adjournment as possible has led, in the opinions of many, to hasty and often irresponsible actions. Senator McGee, D-Wyo., points out that "Good bills representing long hours of investigation and debate are abandoned at the brink of passage; quickly, and sometimes carelessly, prepared legislation is rushed through in the press toward final adjournment, and tempers and physical constitutions—worn and strained by nine or ten months of solid work—approach the breaking point."

MECHANICAL CHORES

Senator McGee has urged the Congress to abandon the idea of nine-month sessions and to recognize the need for year-round meetings. He has also recognized the fact that members of Congress do not have the necessary time for reflection, thought, and consideration. Being in Washington for 12 months is damaging to perspective and broad understanding. He stated: "It can be truthfully said that we are becoming so caught up in the details of our job that all we see and all we have time to worry about are the mechanical chores of the moment. The basic ideas, the concepts by which we live and which we will pass to our posterity are not considered by us for want of time. We see the trees but not the forest."

A possible answer proposed by Senator McGee is a sabbatical leave for members of Congress, patterned on the practices of our large universities and business organizations. The period, according to this proposal, might run from three to six months on a staggered basis so that no more than a handful of members would be gone at one time.

Discussing this idea, Senator Monroney, D-Okla., said that "... the longer a man stays in Congress, generally the more he knows about government, the more he knows and understands about the philosophy of political science, about international affairs and about budgetary control. But he becomes further removed from the position he occupied when he was elected. What (the proposal for a sabbatical) ... is saying is, for Pete's sake get back to being a civilian for six months so that you can come back refreshed with the viewpoint that you had originally but with the backup of the knowledge you have learned as a Senator or Congressman."

WEEK BACK HOME

On August 21 the House of Representatives amended the Legislative Act of 1959 authorizing each member one paid round trip to his district for each month the House is in session. But, what of the time to make such trips?

Commenting on this ironical state of affairs, Rep. Schadeberg, R-Wis., said that "If round trips are to be paid for by the government, then ample opportunity to meet with the people should be provided so that money yields the greatest return. I refer to the suggestions I made for the reorganization of the House which provide a one-week-a-month recess from legislative activity which would provide the members of the House an opportunity to hold office hours in their districts and to discuss pending legislation with interested parties before the legislation was considered on the floor."

Rep. O'Hara, D-Mich., stated that much confusion and uncertainty in Government is caused by the fact that fiscal years begin with continuing authorizations and that government agencies do not know what funds will become available for their programs until after the beginning of fiscal years. He also urged that "Changes in scheduling congressional business also might assist in a personal problem of members which I feel very keenly as the father of seven children of school age. Such changes might assist in making the sessions of Congress correspond more closely with the school year. As it is, the member of Congress with school-age children is forced to have his children at-

tend two different schools in a school year, one back in his district and one in the District of Columbia."

DIVERSE ACTIVITIES

The modern world and the mass society have provided pressures upon government which could hardly have been imagined in a previous, quieter time. Meant to be a reflective body, Congress has been compelled by events to act quickly. Meant to be a body of limited functions and areas of jurisdiction, Congress is now called upon to perform such diverse functions as aiding education, controlling rats in urban areas, and insuring equal employment in private industries. Even when Congress believes an area of consideration to be none of its business, it must still debate and dispose of it.

In his volume, "Congress and the American Tradition," James Burnham points out that "Neither the Fathers nor the philosophers before and after them ever listed speed and efficiency among the virtues of a representative assembly. They wanted 'energy and dispatch' in the executive, but in the legislature, they believed, promptitude of decision is oftener an evil than a benefit. The difference of opinion, and jarrings of parties in the department of the government, though they may sometimes obstruct salutary plans, yet often promote deliberation and circumspection, and serve to check excesses in the majority." (Federalist, Number 70) White haired, slow speaking Nestor, not the impulsive Achilles, the aged Priam and not passionate Troilus, are the archetypes of the legislator."

MISTAKEN STANDARD

The days of such reflective judgment appear to be at an end, just as the days of nine-month sessions of Congress appear to be ended. Yet, it is a situation with which few are happy.

For at a time when Congress is called upon to exercise judgment in an ever broadening range of issues, reflection and an opportunity to see such issues in a realistic national perspective are essential. Decision making, it must be remembered, is not judged by its speed but by its quality. A democracy is not judged by its efficiency but by the essence of its national life. Dictatorships have always proven notably more efficient. Mussolini, after all, did make the trains run on time. Hitler did construct the great German highways, and the Communists did launch Sputnik. For Congress to judge itself by such a mistaken standard would be a serious error.

Congressmen, however, should be more concerned with solving problems than with early Congressional adjournment. Just as many state legislatures have changed from semi-annual to annual sessions, it is now time for Congress to eliminate the facade of nine month sessions and accept the reality of year round meetings.

YEAR-ROUND SESSIONS

If this is done, there will be little temptation to use valuable debate time for a discussion of a projected adjournment date. And, within the context of a realistic approach, proper provision might be made for real vacations and for a real opportunity to meet with constituents and reflect upon the problems of an ever more complex age.

To this end, one upstate New York congressman expressed the view that if business was scheduled on Fridays, those members who leave town regularly for long weekends would be persuaded to stay. Another congressman urged that a one month summer vacation be considered, as well as a vacation in December, and that this be included in the context of a plan for year-round sessions.

Rep. Cleveland, R-N.H., recently announced that he was reactivating the House Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform to put pressure on House Democrats to report out the Congressional Reorganization Bill which has been in the House Rules Com-

mittee since March 9. If this bill reaches the floor during the current session, there is every prospect that the question of year-round sessions will be introduced.

Members of Congress will decide only reluctantly to meet on a year-round basis, but this is an age in which we do many things under protests, and members of Congress are in no way exempt.

LEIF ERICSSON DAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, for the first centuries of recorded history, the American continent was unknown to civilization, as we define it. In the past several hundred years, bloodlines have flowed into this vast land from every corner of the earth. We in the United States have built a great and powerful nation, using the fortitude of the English, the ardor of the Spanish and French, the ingenuity of the Italians, Scandinavian tenacity, Slavic endurance, and the luck of the Irish, plus many more. We have added to this the rhythm of Africa, the mystery of Asia—and yes, the courage of our native Americans.

Men who dreamed dreams of far horizons launched ships out into uncharted waters, and it was inevitable that they would one day reach the shores of this gigantic mass of earth. No group of these voyagers possessed more courage, adventure, hardiness, and perhaps at times, bold foolhardiness, than did the Vikings of the North.

One such Norseman was the Iclander, Leif Ericsson. In about the year 1000 his ship left Greenland to sail northern seas to the west. We have learned that it was this little group of Viking sailors that first touched the shores of the continent to be named America.

They never knew, but perhaps they envisioned, the far-reaching consequences of their journey. This was the new world, and from the old would come those who would one day populate the wilderness, build the cities, till the soil, and fly the banner of freedom.

I hope we will never forget the saga of a long line of courageous men, from Leif Ericsson to our astronauts, nor fail, as a nation, to be worthy of them. That is why we are on this day, October 9, 1967, by proclamation of the President of the United States, commemorating the event of Leif Ericsson's portentous voyage.

THE WASHINGTON POST: WRONG AGAIN

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, once again that great crusading publication, the Washington Post, has seen fit to attack legislation which I have sponsored to permit postal patrons to put a stop to the mailing of unsolicited obscene mail matter sent to their minor children. I am referring to an editorial carried in yesterday's Post.

As I am sure you know, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7977, the postal rate pay bill which will be up for House consideration tomorrow, contains an amendment, title III, which authorizes the Postmaster General, if requested by the addressee, to issue an order to the sender of a "pandering advertisement" to refrain from further mailings of such matter to the named addressee.

Following the U.S. Supreme Court's definition in the Ginzburg case, a "pandering advertisement" is defined as one which offers for sale matter which the advertisement itself represents to be "erotically arousing or sexually provocative." In other words, this legislation merely gives every parent the right to stop the flow of unsolicited smutty advertisements into the mailbox of his home. I suggest that this is the right of every parent, and it is amazing to me that such publications as the Washington Post would oppose this under the spurious banner of free speech.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress the fact that this bill does not preclude those who want such materials from having them delivered to them through the U.S. mails. The Postmaster General is not authorized to act on his own account; he may do so only after having been requested to do so by the named addressee. It is the same as though we were authorizing an individual to call the telephone company and ask it to put a stop to obscene telephone calls being made to his household. Surely no one would argue that to do so would be an invasion of the obscene caller's right of free speech. Yet this is the very type of argument being advanced by the Post.

I have always felt that a man's home is his castle. In my home I have a right to privacy and since my mailbox is an extension of my home, I have a right to keep smut peddlers from dropping solicitations to buy their wares into my mailbox. Certainly I have a right and a duty to exercise some control over the moral upbringing of my children. Yet, presently there is no way for me to stop the flow of unsolicited obscene mail matter to my home. Title III of H.R. 7977 gives every postal patron such an opportunity.

Pandering advertisement in the mail—

Say the editors of the Post—

are an undoubted nuisance. It is not impossible to deal with them, however, in any house equipped with a trash basket or a garbage can.

The editorial concludes. To say this, however, is to admit one's misunderstanding of the problem. It is like saying that one can always hang up on the maker of an obscene telephone call. But parents are not always at home when the children are exposed. Often, one's children are the first to see the mail and by the time the parents come home from work, the damage is already done.

Mr. Speaker, millions of parents want this legislation. It is my fervent hope that none of my colleagues will be deceived by the spurious arguments advanced by this editorial and that they will overwhelmingly support title III of H.R. 7977.

HOUSE MUST SHARE RESPONSIBILITY FOR QUALITY OF DISTRICT GOVERNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker although the other body has the dismal task of approving the President's recent nominees to the new City Council for the District of Columbia, the House must share responsibility for the quality of the District government.

The District of Columbia, the seat of our National Government, is a Federal District, which belongs partly to the citizens of our 50 States—not just to the people who happen to reside here temporarily. The citizens of these 50 States provide, in large measure, the financial support for this Federal District.

If the President had set out to sabotage self-government in Washington, to discredit the new City Council, to exalt patronage, to insult the competent, concerned citizens of the District, to degrade our National Capital in the eyes of our Nation and the world, he could not have succeeded better.

At least three of the President's nominees are incredible.

One is a draft dodger, a Bobby Baker crony, and, according to a creditable magazine article, one of the most influential lobbyists in the Capital. Can you imagine more serious disqualifications for a President of the Council of our Capital City during war?

Another led demonstrations and preached civil disobedience. Can you imagine more serious disqualifications for a Vice President of the City Council during times of civil unrest and disrespect for law and order?

A third nominee accepted attorney's fees to advise a home mortgage company that used despicable methods to bilk the poor and ignorant for profit? Can you imagine more serious disqualifications for a Councilman at a time when this very client is under investigation for criminally duping the poor for profit—and when the District is burdened with so many poor and disadvantaged people?

The reputation of the new City Council—the competency and integrity of each individual Councilman—is crucial to the future of "self-government" for Washington.

Certainly a thorough, comprehensive investigation of each nominee is indicated. A sudden nomination followed by a quick confirmation to avoid public scrutiny and knowledge of the backgrounds of these new Councilmen will contribute to the precipitous failure of District "self-government."

Mr. Speaker, does not the House have the responsibility to investigate, know and report the competency and qualifications of the President's nominees for the new City Council? I believe it does. In this case, where the President's nominees are prima facie incompetent, flagrantly involved with suspicious special interests, totally unrepresentative of the citizens of the District, and all political cronies of this administration, a thorough investigation and comprehensive report to the public is absolutely essential.

STUDY OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VANIK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 1967, the President of the United States made a statement in which he directed the Tariff Commission to make a study of economic conditions in the U.S. textile and apparel industries, particularly with reference to the present and prospective impact of imports upon these industries. He asked the Tariff Commission to report back to him on or before January 15, 1968.

Perhaps there is no subject that has been studied as much as the impact of imports upon the domestic textile and apparel industries. It seems to me that further study is unnecessary to convince anyone that it is time that action be taken to protect the jobs of the American people in these beleaguered facets of our national economy.

I know there was a feeling of encouragement on the part of some industry people when this statement was made last week and I am not here to cast any sort of doubt as to the willingness of the administration to be helpful to our American people, but I have misgivings as to whether there is any basis for encouragement that relief will be had through administrative action.

However, I do believe it is proper that we give a little thought to the possible effect of this statement.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make the statement of the President a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT MADE BY PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON ON OCTOBER 4, 1967

I have today asked the United States Tariff Commission to report to me by January 15, 1968, in the fullest detail possible on the economic conditions of the United States textile and apparel industries.

In this report I expect in particular an intensive analysis of the present and prospective impact of the imports upon these industries.

This administration has consistently acted in recognition of the fact that the textile and apparel industries are of great importance to our economy. In recent months representatives of these industries have expressed to me and to many others a deep concern over their future well-being in light of a number of factors, and especially im-

port trends. A large number of the members of the Congress in both the House and Senate—including Chairman Mills of the Ways and Means Committee—have sponsored bills which deal with the question of imports.

In considering this widespread concern I have concluded that we must have all the facts possible to guide our future actions in this important field, and I am pleased that Chairman Mills is joining my request. I hope that the Tariff Commission's report will permit all of us who are deeply interested in the welfare of the textile and apparel industries to take a course of action which will be both in their interest and the national interest.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, when the House passed the bill written and handled by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], it became apparent to many of us that at long last we had reached a point at which the Congress was going to take this matter into hand and require by law that the people of America have a better deal in the field of foreign trade.

This vote on the Dent bill, which, I believe, produced only 29 adverse votes, was one of the most hopeful signs that some of us had seen.

But now we are wondering if perhaps this order for a so-called study by the Tariff Commission will not be one which might seek to slow down the exercise of the will of the Congress to protect the jobs of American people.

Just a few days ago in Pinehurst, N.C., the former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. John Connor, who is now president, I believe, of Allied Chemical Corp., a concern with a vital stake in textiles, was quoted in the press as having made the statement that—

Textile import quotas as determined on some reasonable basis to fit the overall needs of both foreign and domestic manufacturers in the orderly development of U.S. textile markets are needed in the broad public interest.

Mr. Connor is further quoted as having said:

If the U.S. Government can arrive at no suitable diplomatic conclusions with other nations I think we could consider new grounds for textile imports on a unilateral basis by force of Congressional action.

I believe this brings us to a problem each of us must take into account as we seek to do something for our country in this field of foreign trade. That is, that we not be governed by self-interest in dealing with the establishment of sound trade policies. This present hopeful sign for the textile industry might be considered by some other industry people who are equally injured by imports as holding out hope for the textile industry which is not held out for other industries which are hurt by imports.

As one who has been particularly interested in textiles, I believe it would be a great mistake if those of us who do have, because of our local industry, some peculiar interest in a particular industry, should ever let ourselves get diverted in selfish desire to serve our own particular interests, so that we will not have served the national interest.

May I confine myself today to the textile field? No one can question that imports are now ruining the job opportunities of more than 200,000 Americans

in the textile industry who are debarred from employment there because of imports. Even a greater number are affected by curtailed operations in the textile industry as a direct and proximate result of the importation of inordinate amounts of textile products and apparel products.

Many other industries have taken up the cudgel for textiles because they see in this problem something broader than many of our friends who feel we are only concerned about the jobs of people in the textile field. The textile industry spends each year \$10 billion with other industries for various services. This includes the trucking companies, paper mill operators, power companies, sheep ranchers, corn farmers, construction workers, machinery manufacturers, the chemical industry, the cotton producers, and the producer of machinery for the textile industry.

The trucking industry last year earned more than \$100 million from the textile industry and hauled about 90 percent of all the American textiles that were manufactured and shipped within our own country. Paper manufacturers earned about \$240 million from the sale of paper supplies for the textile industry. Power companies sold about \$150 million worth of electrical power to the industry. The wool producers, that is, the sheep ranchers, sold 370 million pounds of wool costing about \$190 million. The corn farmers, the corn raisers, found their product used in making 315 million pounds of corn starch for which the textile industry paid \$31 million. Construction workers built more than \$500 million worth of new plants, and textile machinery manufacturers sold about \$640 million worth of new equipment. The chemical plants producing manmade fibers sold about 4 billion pounds of their fibers at a cost of \$2.4 billion. Cotton farmers sold about 9.5 million bales of raw cotton for about \$1 billion.

On top of that, when we take into account that the domestic textile industry paid \$4.6 billion in wages which went into the economy of many hundreds of communities throughout this Nation, into the office of the attorney, the physician, the drugstore, the department store, and every other phase of economic life in the local community, you begin to see that this is an important problem which confronts not just the textile industry but all the people of America.

I was interested today to receive from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers a bulletin in which they express their views on the statement of the President to which I have referred earlier. They say, among other things, in their statement:

We share the President's desire to have all of the facts possible concerning the textile import problem, and we shall, of course, cooperate with the Tariff Commission in its endeavor.

The present critical need for limitations on textile imports is well established, however, and the pendency of this new study should not delay action by the Congress upon pending textile import quota legislation.

The existence of the textile import problem has already been recognized by the President, who has publicly stated that reasonable limitations on wool textile imports are necessary, and by 68 Members of the

Senate and 174 Members of the House who are sponsoring legislation to enable him to effectuate his policy. The industry's resources will continue to be kept fully mobilized to achieve prompt enactment of this legislation.

And, may I say, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that other industry representatives, whatever the phase of their textile operations in which they may engage, will follow the lead of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers in insisting that, notwithstanding the study by the Tariff Commission, the Congress proceed promptly with the legislation which so many of us are cosponsoring here in the House and which so many of our colleagues are cosponsoring in the Senate.

This is a serious problem. We talk about manpower retraining very glibly. In the Trade Expansion Act it was provided that there should be some funds available to retrain people who were put out of their jobs because of imports. I say to you that this is an indefensible sort of thing. It should be our view and it should be our deep concern to see to it that no American is deprived of his job by reason of foreign imports whatever the industry may be.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that all the Members of the House who are interested in this problem will insist that we proceed on schedule with the consideration of the pending bill which is commonly referred to as the "Mills bill," and which has been sponsored by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], and approximately 176 others of us.

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and to congratulate the gentleman upon a splendid statement relating to problems that confront the textile industry today.

I particularly am appreciative of the gentleman's remarks to the effect that legislation is going to be required, apparently, before the problem is solved, both for the textile industry and for many other types of industries in the United States, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina for his very splendid recognition of the facts of this matter.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my friend and neighbor, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GETTYS], for his contribution. I hope that neither he nor others of my colleagues understand that what I am saying has to be limited to our concern about the textile industry. There are, for instance, the shoe industry, the athletic goods industry, the steel industry, and many others which are equally involved in this fight. I think we should not stand by and get ourselves blocked off as we have in the past. We should present a united front and be just as interested in the dairy farmer who is now being hurt by imports, the steel manufacturer and the employees of the steel industry, as we are in our particular area of interest.

Mr. GETTYS. The gentleman has correctly stated that there are so many related industries that are dependent upon these textile industries, which is the point we are raising on this subject.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude I am expressing to all of my colleagues the fervent plea that they not be diverted from this effort which seems to be on its way to success, as is evidenced by the recent vote in the House on the very significant legislation from the Committee on Education and Labor which was given to us from the hand and mind of the very able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]. I hope we can all be steadfast in our zeal for this American program of a sound trade policy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS— PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 13178.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING EMERGENCY FOOD AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO HUN- GRY AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VANİK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last the distinguished Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, acting on S. 2138, voted to put the bill aside without prejudice.

This legislation, authored by Senator STENNIS in the other body, permits the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide emergency food and medical assistance to hungry Americans in whatever State they may be found.

While I am pleased that the committee has kept the bill open for action, I am expressing my very deep concern that the time has long since passed when this or similar legislation should have been passed by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is to me, nothing short of shocking, that in a country having an annual Federal budget in excess of 130 thousands of millions of dollars, questions of economy should be raised on the expenditure of \$25 million to feed Americans who, for no fault of their own, are not being cared for under existing State or Federal programs, and whose children are found to be in a state of physical malnutrition, and in some places near starvation.

I am delighted that the distinguished Committee on Agriculture wisely chose to make public its executive hearing of last week, but I would hope that the committee would undertake further public hearings to make the record very

plain as to the extent and character of the nutrition and allied medical problems widely varying estimates have been received as to the number of Americans who are suffering from serious malnutrition, and those estimates must be refined and made as precise as possible. I believe that the Congress would certainly impugn both its humanity and its responsibility if it does not thoroughly, fully, and publicly examine these assertions of hunger and malnutrition.

This can only be done properly if it is done through extended public hearings.

Even if the character of the problem has been exaggerated or misrepresented, such information would be a valuable addition. But I do not believe this is the case. On the contrary, I believe the problem is a real one, a pressing one, a critical one, and becomes exacerbated every week, as we approach in some areas of our country a harsh winter. Surely no Member of this House would wish that Americans here in our own country should be denied such fundamental aid at a time when our history of generosity to other peoples has passed a level of \$120 billion in aid since World War II.

I have supported the foreign aid bill every year that I have been a Member of the Congress. But if the time ever comes when this country cannot afford to undertake responsibility for its own people, I will cease to support the foreign aid budget and I will cease to support many other domestic programs which can be put aside until these fundamental responsibilities can be undertaken.

In fact, I do not think that this need is in any sense beyond our present capacity. The testimony of the Bureau of the Budget officials was that present authorizations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were sufficient to carry out the purposes of this program.

Mr. Speaker, so that every Member may have the benefit of the findings and recommendations of the very distinguished group of American citizens known as the Ad Hoc Committee on Emergency Food To Fight Hunger in the United States, I ask unanimous consent that its summary statement, dated September 27, 1967, by Mr. Robert B. Choate be included in its entirety in the RECORD, including its appendices of extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have listened to the gentleman's statement and not having seen this statement in its entirety, I note that earlier there were some newspaper stories, and stories from other sources, that reflected considerably on the area that I have the honor to represent.

To keep the record straight, this committee went only to certain specified areas, the medical committee, which the gentleman will recall. As soon as this was called to my attention, as a Representative of that area, I called on the people in authority in my State and asked them to check out all the names submitted to me by the Department of Agriculture.

As I recall, without exception all of the names listed were drawing relief.

There seems to be no question that in many areas of the country, that there are a few, a relatively few numerically, who are suffering from malnutrition. But by the same token, a research and study was made of this particular group in only one particular section of the country.

Following that I wrote Senator CLARK and Senator JAVITS, who had identified themselves with this study project, and asked for a list of names of the persons that this group had found. That was some 2 months ago and just today I had an acknowledgement by letter, but no individuals names were listed in it.

So I would trust that the report that the gentleman is putting in the RECORD is not pointing the finger at one particular section of the country because this study quite definitely is not national in its scope. Insofar as my area is concerned, we deplore even one such case and we thank the Secretary of Agriculture for making this statement available and trust that what the gentleman is including in the RECORD is fair in its content.

Mr. FOLEY. I am very glad that the gentleman has taken this occasion to make his comments. There is no question in my judgment that the area which, as he says, he has the honor to represent, has been unfairly singled out in some quarters as the locus of this problem. Actually, malnutrition and allied problems exist in many parts of the United States. They exist, in my judgment, in several of the Northern States and in many of our northern metropolitan areas as well as in some rural areas. The gentleman's State is at the top of the list in participation by the poor in food programs in the United States.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I felt free to interrupt the gentleman because I know of his fairness in dealing with these matters. But not having seen the report I did want to make this statement that I have made.

Mr. FOLEY. If there is any question as to the report or any of the material which I have put into the RECORD today unfairly representing the problem as being limited to or particularly aimed at the gentleman's area, I would be happy to participate with him in putting the matter into a national perspective. I know the gentleman's State has done far more to care for people who are poor than many other States in the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN. I accept the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Washington for a very good statement. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture who last week sat through the deliberations and the hearings that are now a matter of public record, I would like to emphasize that

the gentleman's colloquy with the gentleman from Mississippi clarified a situation that has distressed many of us because of untrue implications that seemed to pinpoint one area only. I think perhaps also it would be a good time to point out that this was one of the reasons the committee voted not to complete action on the bill at this time, but to hold it over without prejudice until such time as we had more information from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Both of those agencies testified that they had not asked for the bill and were at this time unprepared to give us reliable facts and figures on which we could write legislation that would really pinpoint the problem and solve it. I think the gentleman has put part of our dilemma in good context with his statement.

Will the gentleman yield further so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. FOLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. On the day that the House Committee on Agriculture met, one of the members of that committee issued a press release concerning what went on in this executive session. In the release there was a statement saying committee members exhibited "joy over the imminent suffocation of this bill." This press release was put out before the committee even had an opportunity to vote. The gentleman was present at the hearing on that day, as was I. May I ask the gentleman this question for the record: At any time when the committee was discussing, deliberating, and asking questions on this bill, did you see any signs of unbecoming levity or opinions expressed that this was not a very serious problem that we had to solve?

Mr. FOLEY. I would be glad to say on my own part I was then convinced and am now convinced that all members of the committee took the matter very seriously. I did not draw the conclusion that others may have drawn from any levity that did exist in the committee. I think each member of the committee approaches this problem very seriously. I think the committee as a whole has been concerned about problems coming under its jurisdiction which have relevance to this condition or this problem. I hope that there will be prompt further consideration by the committee.

The only respect in which I disagree in any way with my distinguished friend and colleague from Washington is that I feel a temporary authorization, at least, should be given to cope with situations of real hunger and malnutrition discovered in the United States which cannot be cared for by any existing program while we are waiting for additional information.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. May I say to the gentleman I think the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture should give

this immediate aid under present programs until we have the facts and figures, to honestly, intelligently, and factually argue in favor of this bill when we bring it before the House of Representatives. I thank the gentleman for his answer to my question.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I simply asked you to yield for the purpose of further clarifying your unanimous consent request which I believe is before the House, namely, to include the summary plus the entire bill. May I ask the gentleman if this is not in print either in the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture or as a report of the Commission, simply on the basis of not being advised on the question of the availability therein, and the fact that it costs the taxpayers some \$210 a page for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his question. I am delighted to have the opportunity to answer it, because, in fact, it is not otherwise available. The initial public hearings which were scheduled by the House Agriculture Committee were not held because individuals who had indicated a desire to testify later informed the committee that they would be willing not to testify if the committee was going to move to go into executive session to consider the bill. Consequently the statement in question is not in the record of the hearings.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlemen will yield further, then neither the Commission itself nor the proper House committee appropriation for the Commission, either out of the executive contingency fund or by appropriation, includes any amount for the cost of printing?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman may have misunderstood my request. This is not an official document. It is the testimony of a member of a private group interested in this problem which is not printed in any Government-authorized publication to my knowledge.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman. I thought it was an official document.

Mr. FOLEY. The ad hoc committee is a wholly private organization.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserved the right to object. In view of the explanation of the gentleman, I will not object and I will read the statement with interest, and, if further statements are required, I will make them at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Washington is granted.

There was no objection.

(The summary referred to follows:)

SUMMARY STATEMENT TO THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE AS IT CONSIDERS S. 2138, THE EMERGENCY FOOD BILL, BY THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY FOOD TO FIGHT HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES, SEPTEMBER 27, 1967

Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert B. Choate. I am a businessman from Arizona;

I am a civil engineer and a land (and farm) developer, when I am not involving myself in the problems of our society. Currently, I am spending a sabbatical year away from Arizona. Most of my time is occupied with interesting businessmen and business organizations with depressed area problems. In February, I started an evaluation of the commodity and food stamp programs from the recipient perspective. That work has so intrigued me that I am currently on leave of absence from my other work to seek the enactment of the Emergency Food Bill—S. 2138. The Ad Hoc Committee on Emergency Food To Fight Hunger in the United States has asked me to prepare a summary statement of those points of view which the Committee would have heard on September 29 had not an Executive Session replaced a public hearing.

It is an honor to be able to approach the House Agriculture Committee in this regard. Many of the members of this Committee have been in the forefront of increasing the agricultural cornucopia of the United States. Many of the members have contributed to the development of new products, new farming techniques, and new delivery systems. We are, as a result, one of the best fed countries on earth. The Chairman of this Committee is particularly to be praised for his understanding of the intricacies of feeding the world's hungry.

The Ad Hoc Committee supports the Senate Committee report and the bill as it was passed by the Senate.

The possibility of hunger in our affluent society raises questions of responsibility. Under the *Rules of the House of Representatives*, the Committee on Agriculture has many duties pertaining to agriculture, including "Human Nutrition and Home Economics". One assumes this description includes "hunger". If people are hungry in America, is it a problem of employment, income, or distribution systems? Of education or of health? Is it a problem of improving the balance of the diet or the size and number of daily meals throughout the changing seasons? Those deep in poverty may not have enough to satisfy a hungry stomach; others may attempt to fill their stomachs with inferior, unbalanced foods. While we believe that the matter of hunger in the United States may be as much a problem of poverty or health, we here address ourselves to the responsibilities of the House Agriculture Committee on the nutrition aspects of feeding America's hungry.

Poverty is an ugly word; consideration of the living conditions of those in poverty is not pleasant. We all wish that we could match jobs with the jobless, so that most of our citizens need have no fear of hunger. Perhaps that time is coming. Meanwhile, we face a situation wherein unidentified numbers of our own citizens may be suffering from malnutrition and hunger. S. 2138 has many aspects which can clarify this situation.

People who are concerned with poverty within the United States recognize that there must be relative positions on the ladder of success in a competitive society. Those at the bottom of the ladder—economically, culturally, and educationally—are recognized to be in need of occasional forms of monetary support. In general, we call this welfare. In specifics, we use the terms "old age assistance", "aid to the blind", "aid to the permanently and totally disabled", "aid to families with dependent children", and "general assistance". These forms of welfare were initiated to ensure that all residents of our country, despite infirmities or personal poverty, would be supplied with the three basic needs of mankind: food, clothing, and shelter.

For many reasons, this nation has been parsimonious in setting individual levels of welfare assistance. As partial recompense for this, welfare checks are occasionally augmented by other forms of aid: private

charity, rent subsidies, and government food programs. It is to the last of these that this paper addresses itself.

Federal food programs are a means of providing the most impoverished citizens of the United States with enough food to maintain life with a minimum of suffering. The best known of these programs is the Commodity Distribution Program. Conceived in 1935 and further defined in 1949, the Commodity Distribution program was enacted "to prevent the waste of food commodities . . . through deterioration or spoilage" by making them "available . . . to local public welfare organizations . . . (and) to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States".

In 1964, a second federal food program was legislated. Known as the Food Stamp Program, it was designed "to strengthen the agricultural economy . . . (and) to provide for improved levels of nutrition among low-income households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance".

Thirty-two years after the passage of the first federal food distribution program, we see a nation which ships more than 11 million tons of food to foreign countries a year, pays individual farmers more than \$3 billion annually and wages a losing battle against the daily disposal of 137 truckloads of garbage in its capital city alone. We also see a nation in which perhaps 7 out of 8 of the poorest residents are unable to participate in a government food program. We know that some are hungry.

HUNGER VERSUS FAMINE

The current nationwide hearings being conducted by the Citizens' Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States¹ already have shown that hunger in America is different from famine. People are not "dropping like flies" on American streets because not enough food is being produced. In the United States, hunger and severe malnutrition exist because of economic, political, racial, and educational problems. It is not an agricultural problem. There can be no doubt that this nation has the money to feed hungry people; a competitive political system should be able to break bureaucratic bonds inhibiting the delivery of food to the hungry; a nation committed to racial equality should be able to distribute food to black, brown, and white alike; a government which believes in education for all should be able to teach the poor to buy and process foodstuffs in a manner which will guarantee some nutrient balance to their menus.

Thus, it appears that the obstacles separating our country's overflowing cornucopia and the shriveled stomachs of less-than-fortunate children are manmade. We approach the House Agriculture Committee to review its position in regard to the feeding of the poorest of the poor. Access to food is an international issue today. Shouldn't we, at home, show the world how our system guarantees freedom from hunger?

WHO KNOWS WHAT ABOUT NUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES?

The United States Public Health Service employs 40,376 persons. Only a few of these can be considered dietitians or nutritionists. There are 88 accredited medical schools in the country. Those at Harvard, M.I.T., the University of Iowa, Vanderbilt and Tulane seem noted for their contributions to this science. Throughout the country, there may be 20,000 professionals whom we can group under the title "dietitians and nutritionists". They are not well dispersed. The Past President of the American Society for Clinical Nutrition and the current Treasurer of the American Institute of Nutrition, Willard A. Krehl, M.D., Ph.D., recently submitted some rather pertinent comments:²

"I can assure you that there certainly would not be more than 50 nutritionists working in association with State health departments in the United States since many states do not have a nutritionist and, in fact, our own state of Iowa now is without the services of a nutritionist since the one who was employed resigned for other occupations."

Dr. Nevin S. Scrimshaw, Professor of Nutrition and Head of the Department of Nutrition and Food Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, commented that: ". . . clinical nutrition is not even taught in most medical schools and is not really adequately done in any of them."

Dr. Fredrick J. Stare, Chairman of the Department of Nutrition at the Harvard School of Public Health, summed up his comments on this subject by saying: ". . . There could be, and probably is, extensive undernourishment and malnutrition in the United States, but no one really knows. It is most unfortunate that none of our public health services at any level—national, state, city or town—have so far been concerned about the health of Americans of any social or economic class as it may relate to nutrition."

HOW ABOUT DOCTORS?

We posed the following question to several experts in the field of nutrition: To what degree are this nation's doctors prepared to identify malnutrition in a patient who walks through the door?

We gleaned the responses from telephone calls, letters, and previously written articles for professional publications:

Dr. Stare: "Not very well. Unfortunately, most physicians are not well trained to identify malnutrition except for gross under- or overweight, and this anyone can do."

Dr. Scrimshaw: "I would say very poorly."

Vonda Webb, Supervisor of Nutrition Services, Mississippi State Board of Health: "This varies with the physician, but I feel that most physicians rely on more detailed tests than observation or clinical appraisal."

Dr. Harry S. Lipscomb, Chairman, Department of Biochemistry, Texas Medical Center, Baylor University College of Medicine, Houston, Texas: "In short, neither are physicians prepared to identify malnutrition in their daily practice simply because they are not thinking of it . . ."

Dr. Krehl: "The fundamental principles of nutritional evaluation are no different from the classical ones of medicine and are based on careful general observation, adequate history including dietary history, complete physical examination, and appropriate laboratory studies. Along with these techniques, the most important factor in considering nutritional status in the total evaluation of the patient is—to think about it."³

WHO HAS DONE BROAD RESEARCH?

We asked our correspondents a second question: To what extent have the eating habits of the American poor (and their nutrition levels) been researched by competent authorities on a state, regional, or national basis?

Dr. Scrimshaw: "We know less about the eating habits of the various social and economic groups in the United States than in many developing countries because so few surveys have been carried out. The surveys of the U.S. Department of Agriculture do not, of course, give this type of information."

Dr. Stare: "Few, practically no attempts have been made to research the eating habits of the poor in our country or to study their nutritional health."

Dr. Lipscomb: ". . . I know of no recent studies in our country which have attempted to re-examine the problems of the eating habits of the American poor, which really search in depth both the nature and magni-

tude of the problem, as well as perhaps more importantly its long-term effect on the social, physical, and intellectual growth and development of our country."

Dr. Paul B. Pearson, President of The Nutrition Foundation: "The eating habits and nutritional status of low income families have been and are now being studied by both state and federal agencies."

WHAT ABOUT THE PRIVATE SECTOR?

The difference of opinion led us to interview many of the employees and executives of the nation's major food manufacturing concerns. (They are the main source of funds for The Nutrition Foundation.) Most of those interviewed preferred that we not identify them as speaking for their company. We asked them the following three questions:

1. What firms or organizations have done extensive research among the poor to establish eating habits, nutrition levels, and preparation customs?

2. What is the extent of knowledge within the industry relative to nutrition levels among the poor?

3. Have any firms developed low-cost food supplements which could be made available to the poor to up-grade their present nutrient intake?

Of the eight representatives of major food manufacturing firms with whom we spoke (in most cases, the Director of Nutrition Research) none knew of any significant research done in the area under consideration. The most frequent answer given to these three questions was, "I don't know of anything at all that's been done." One official of a soup company said, "If we saw evidence of profitability, we might look into this." A nutritionist with a major dairy concern, who was recommended to us by several other respondents as the person most knowledgeable about nutrition studies by private entities, said, "I don't know of a single study in this field by a private company." A spokesman for the cereal industry admitted, "We have been concerned with low cost food developments outside the United States and have looked a little inside, but we can't market to a specific income group." A highly respected nutritionist in the meat area told us, "I know there's a high incidence of malnutrition in this country. We learn that from Washington. That's why we have food programs."

In almost every instance, the persons we contacted were confident that their firms or industries would take on this task "if we knew there was a mass market . . . if we could justify it to our stockholders."

Our earlier correspondents, when asked the same questions, answered:

Dr. Krehl: "It is difficult not to be derogatory in answering this question but in reality, the attention of the manufacturer is directed to the area in which he can sell his product and advertising of course is similarly directed. . . . It is true however, on the other hand, that segments of the commercial industry have directed educational programs to all levels of our population including the poor and I cite such organizations as the National Dairy Council, the American Dairy Association, the Cereal Institute, among others."

Dr. Stare: "I'm not aware that our private food companies have addressed themselves to the nutritional problems of the nation's poor."

While our samples are small, we believe our correspondents to be among the most knowledgeable persons in the area of nutrition. We must therefore take their response as an indication that this affluent nation has never seriously studied the possibility of malnutrition in its midst. We believe most food concerns have not sought a market in fighting domestic malnutrition among the poor. For this reason, we believe the portion of S 2138 which calls for "a comprehensive study of the incidence and location of serious hunger and malnutrition . . . in the United

¹ See Appendix.

² Copies of related letters from correspondents can be provided upon request.

³ From the *Medical Clinics of North America*, Sept. 1964, Vol. 48, No. 5, p. 1139.

States" is an imperative part of the bill. Such a study can point to the economic, political, cultural, seasonal, regional and racial aspects of hunger in an affluent society.

IS EXISTING LEGISLATION ADEQUATE TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF THE HUNGRY POOR?

The commodity distribution and food stamp programs should be able to care for the nation's hungry. At present, however, many areas do not use either of these programs for a variety of reasons. Both programs require a state to pay for local administrative costs. Most states pass this cost on to local county jurisdictions, where the decision to operate or not operate a program is made. Many counties in our country are too poor to pay the price of administration, even though it may be as little as \$8 per recipient per year. A vast number of the nation's poor are in such counties. Other counties are disinclined to offer a food program for other economic reasons, or for political or other reasons.

Another problem, created by the wording of the Food Stamp Act itself, is that the two programs cannot operate simultaneously in one area "except during emergency situations caused by a national or other disaster as determined by the Secretary (of Agriculture)". In the Summer of 1967, Secretary Freeman stated that he does not have the power to declare a national or other disaster, and, therefore, he cannot authorize the distribution of life-saving commodities to people found starving in rural pockets or urban ghettos where a food stamp program exists. S 2138 would give the Secretary that authority. It would enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Agriculture to jointly act where local conditions preclude the feeding of hungry and severely malnourished people. (S 2138 can not be invoked in case of disaster.)

Through the provisions of S 2138, persons who cannot afford food stamps or who, for reasons of length-of-residency or other restricting requirements, cannot be certified for a food program, can for the first time be fed. S 2138 should be regarded as an emergency food measure, and not as a third means of feeding the poor. This emergency food distribution capability is of paramount importance to the bill, for it fills a gap left by both of the existing pieces of legislation. Use of S 2138 should be focused on the short-term emergency situation while local and federal agencies devise better use of dominant commodity and food stamp programs.

HOW WELL DO THE FOOD STAMP AND COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS DO THEIR JOB?

As we have said, the existing federal food programs should be able to care for the nation's hungry in areas where they operate. An analysis of their performance shows that they do not.

The Office of Economic Opportunity defines "poor" with the use of a sliding scale, based on 124 values graduated according to family income, size, composition, and location. On this basis, OEO estimates that in 1960 there were over 38 and one-half million poor persons in the United States. While this figure seems alarmingly high to some officials, we do not feel that a consensus opinion of the exact number of poor is necessary at this time. The gross number is obviously high enough to warrant national attention. (Even if OEO's figure were cut in half, the performance of our federal food programs would have to be considered inadequate.)

In June of 1967, the United States Department of Agriculture reported that 4,833,428 persons were served by either a commodity or a food stamp program. (There were 6.1 million being helped by commodities alone in October 1961.) 4.8 million is only 12% of OEO's estimate of the total number of poor in this country. This means that, if government figures are accurate, 7 out of 8 poor

persons are not helped by existing food distribution programs. We do not believe that everyone defined by OEO to be poor should have access to governmental food programs. Some states have welfare payments of sufficient size to nearly meet the needs of the recipients. Some families who are poor may have occasional income to let them live without starving. But when two federal programs designed to feed the poor bat 12% in their performance, one is provoked to look behind the general statistics.

Let us look at the individual programs. Commodity recipients dropped 1.8 million in the last year to a level where 3,004,376 persons received this form of food help. Commodities were available in 1280 jurisdictions (mainly counties) out of a total of 3,130. "Available" may be a misleading term. In one county, with 1873 designated poor persons, 16 were participating in a supposedly active commodity program in June of this year. In another county, with 40,083 designated poor, only 1646—or 2.45%—participated.

Food stamp recipients, whose number rose 50% in the last year, totalled 1,829,052. Food stamps were available in 338 jurisdictions (mostly counties) out of the national total of 3130. Again, however, caution should be used in looking at the figures, for in one county with 5483 persons adjudged poor, only 72 of them participated in the food stamp program. In the North and West, participants are generally those on welfare; in the South, the converse is true.

One should note that 1012 jurisdictions (mostly counties) offer neither food stamps nor commodities to their poor populations.

Thus we see that 33.7 million persons adjudged poor by OEO find no relief in the food stamp or commodity programs.

We have researched specific areas and regions. We have tabulated elsewhere how various states, and various Congressional districts, utilize the food stamp and commodity programs. Urban areas seem to prefer food stamps. Rural areas seem to prefer commodities. Poor counties seem to shy away from both.

The northern tier of states has many an area where the poor are offered little or no access to these food programs. For example, 1.1% of those adjudged poor in Hartford, Connecticut, participate in a food program. In Lehigh County (Allentown), Pennsylvania, 1066 out of 25,500 designated poor participate.

The following statement may sum up an area of high importance to this Committee:

Of 283 counties with high poor populations surveyed in the states from Texas to Delaware, 93 had neither program and thus 3,000,000 persons adjudged poor had no access to these programs; in the 190 counties that did have either commodities or food stamps, 6 million out of 7 million adjudged poor had no help from either federal food program. Welfare grants in these states are generally below the national average.⁴

THE IMPACT OF HUNGER

Many members have indicated in past hearings that the non-working and non-tax-paying poor are in need of jobs. The child of a malnourished mother starts with a strike against him, for brain damage and premature birth are suspected products of malnutrition in a conceiving mother. The hungry child is high onto uneducable. The malnourished youth is unambitious when it comes to sustained work. The malnourished parent is preoccupied with his stomach and not his job. The aging adult fears early death due to lack of lifelong good eating habits. Our society may have some who show little will to work; our society cannot expect good work habits of those to whom hunger is a way of life.

"Childhood malnutrition causes retardation."

⁴ See appendixes for substantiating details.

tion of physical growth and development and recent evidence suggests that mental development may be impaired also. In malnourished preschool children, mortality and morbidity are extremely high and the common infectious diseases of childhood are catastrophic.

"Nutrition has a vital role in the health of adults, also, and influences socio-economic and cultural development profoundly. Malnutrition leads to deterioration of physical fitness and mental efficiency, to emotional and personality disturbances, and to reduction in the capacity to perform work." (Excerpt from *The World Food Problem*. A Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Vol. 1, p. 43, The White House, May 1967.)

S. 2138 has a health component related to hunger. If those who are found to be malnourished are in need of medical care as well as long-term improvement in their menus, S. 2138 authorizes emergency health care for such persons. Again, this should be recognized as an emergency measure. In most counties and jurisdictions there are medical services which can prescribe remedies for those who are suffering. We must be slightly wary of the ability of intake clinicians to identify malnutrition, for our aforesaid responses do not lead one to be happy about the preparation of doctors, much less nurses, in the field of nutrition.

SUMMARY

The members of the House Agriculture Committee realize that food and food systems are the world's major preoccupation. *U.S. News and World Report* recently indicated we have succeeded to a degree of perhaps 96%. The 4% remaining—8 million persons—are the means by which we can prove to the world that there is a food system answer here in America. If we can eradicate hunger even among our most poverty-stricken, the skeptics of our free enterprise society will have been rebutted on one more front. S 2138 can be the lever by which existing agencies and programs meet the need of America's chronically hungry.

I thank the Committee for letting the Ad Hoc Committee on Emergency Food to Fight Hunger in the United States make this statement. We submit it with the realization that the Committee members are aware of our food resources and with the certainty that the members are fully committed, this year, to freedom from hunger in the United States. Thank you.

APPENDIX A

Average percentage of poor participating in food programs, June 1967—All States

Alaska	0.3
Virginia	1.8
South Carolina	1.9
Connecticut	3.0
Idaho	4.0
Nebraska	4.5
Texas	5.0
Massachusetts	5.5
Kansas	5.6
Nevada	6.0
New Jersey	6.0
New Hampshire	7.0
Maine	7.1
Iowa	7.2
California	7.6
Indiana	7.8
Louisiana	7.9
North Carolina	8.0
Hawaii	8.2
Tennessee	8.8
Florida	9.0
Alabama	9.1

⁵ Vol. LXIII, No. 10, Sept. 4, 1967, pp. 50-53. "Is U.S. Really Filled with Poverty? A Look at the Facts", by John B. Parrish.

APPENDIX A—Continued

Average percentage of poor participating in food programs, June 1967—All States—Con.

Minnesota	9.1
Wisconsin	9.1
Missouri	9.5
North Dakota	9.7
Georgia	10.6
Montana	10.9
Maryland	11.0
Washington, D.C.	11.7
Colorado	12.0
Illinois	12.0
Pennsylvania	12.0
Utah	12.0
Vermont	12.0
Kentucky	13.0
Michigan	13.0
South Dakota	13.0
Rhode Island	13.5
Arkansas	14.0
Wyoming	14.0
Washington	14.9
Ohio	15.5
West Virginia	16.4
New York	18.5
Oregon	21.3
New Mexico	24.0
Arizona	26.0
Delaware	31.0
Oklahoma	31.0
Mississippi	32.0

APPENDIX B

Average welfare payment per recipient, 1966—All States

Mississippi	\$34.16
West Virginia	39.71
South Carolina	40.23
Georgia	46.13
Florida	46.72
Alabama	47.11
Indiana	48.01
Nebraska	50.03
Utah	51.45
Nevada	52.61
Virginia	52.90
Tennessee	52.95
Arkansas	53.95
North Carolina	54.12
Texas	54.31
Arizona	55.37
Kentucky	55.98
Louisiana	56.39
New Mexico	57.70
Maine	57.80
Wisconsin	58.38
Washington	59.40
Maryland	59.62
Vermont	60.13
South Dakota	60.32
Idaho	60.71
Montana	61.21
Missouri	61.46
Minnesota	62.02
Rhode Island	62.30
Wyoming	62.37
Oregon	62.63
Washington, D.C.	62.77
Iowa	63.20
Colorado	64.09
Illinois	64.80
Ohio	65.56
Alaska	65.85
Delaware	66.36
Connecticut	69.72
North Dakota	71.09
New Jersey	71.40
Pennsylvania	74.12
Oklahoma	77.87
Michigan	79.27
Kansas	79.46
Hawaii	79.50
New Hampshire	84.97
Massachusetts	85.12
New York	85.17
California	98.32

APPENDIX C

Rank of districts represented by Members of House Agriculture Committee in percent of poor constituents participating in food program

Congressmen:	
Brasco, Democrat, New York	(¹)
Abbutt, Democrat, Virginia	0
Hansen, Republican, Idaho	0.03
Dole, Republican, Kansas	.79
Poage, Democrat, Texas	1.52
Kleppe, Republican, North Dakota	2.47
Price, Republican, Texas	3.41
Dow, Democrat, New York	3.60
Rarick, Democrat, Louisiana	4.71
Mayne, Republican, Iowa	5.41
Goodling, Republican, Pennsylvania	5.69
de la Garza, Democrat, Texas	5.92
Zwach, Republican, Minnesota	6.49
McMillan, Democrat, South Carolina	6.60
Mathias, Republican, California	7.26
Wampler, Republican, Virginia	7.46
Purcell, Democrat, Texas	7.80
Resnick, Democrat, New York	8.56
Nichols, Democrat, Alabama	9.34
Burke, Republican, Florida	10.13
Stubblefield, Democrat, Kentucky	10.32
Miller, Republican, Ohio	10.49
Myers, Republican, Indiana	10.95
Teague, Republican, California	11.13
Jones, Democrat, North Carolina	13.34
Stuckey, Democrat, Georgia	13.50
O'Neal, Democrat, Georgia	16.60
May, Republican, Washington	17.42
Belcher, Republican, Oklahoma	18.45
Gathings, Democrat, Arkansas	18.48
Foley, Democrat, Washington	20.11
Vigorito, Democrat, Pennsylvania	22.59
Jones, Democrat, Missouri	22.96
Abernethy, Democrat, Mississippi	29.90
Montgomery, Democrat, Mississippi	38.04
National average	12.70

¹ Not able to be calculated.

APPENDIX D

[From "The World Food Problem," A Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, vol. 1, The White House, May 1967]

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

In all of recorded history, none have surpassed the American people in willingness to share their abundance with others. We have given unstintingly of our material wealth and our precious human resources to benefit the less fortunate of this earth. We have sought to restore those whom war has shattered. We have sought to provide assistance to the newly independent members of the family of nations who are making the effort to break the shackles of tradition and achieve a better life for their peoples.

But as success in programs to eradicate disease and to improve health have given more and more millions the opportunity to live out their natural span of life, the problem of hunger has lingered on and the shadow of starvation and impending famine has grown ever darker.

Hunger's unceasing anguish drains hope, crushes aspirations, and obstructs the generation of programs of self-help. The threat of starvation sets man against man and citizen against government, leading to civil strife and political unrest.

Our programs to help these new countries to increase food production have brought about striking improvement in a few instances. But in the total balance, food has not kept pace with population and the developing world continues to lose ground in this race.

The World Food Problem is one of the foremost challenges of mankind today. The dimension of the challenge will define the dimension of our response and the means for

that response. We must join with others in a massive effort to help the less fortunate of the earth to help themselves. I am making this report public because of its significance for the American people and people all over the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

APPENDIX E

CITIZENS' BOARD OF INQUIRY INTO HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES
COCHAIRMAN

Mays, Dr. Benjamin E.—Past President, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia; Dunbar, Leslie—Executive Director, Field Foundation, Inc., New York, New York.

MEMBERS

Ashmore, Dr. Harry—Author, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California;

Carter, James, M.D.—Pediatrician, Division of Nutrition, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee;

Corcoran, Msgr. Lawrence J.—Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C.;

Corrigan, Rt. Rev. Daniel—Director, Home Department, Executive Council of Episcopal Churches, New York, New York;

Deloria, Vine, Jr.—Executive Director, National Congress of American Indians, Denver, Colorado;

Dorsen, Dr. Norman—Professor of Law, and Director, Arthur Garfield Hays Civil Liberties Program, New York University School of Law, New York, New York;

Esser, George—Executive Director, North Carolina Fund, Durham, North Carolina;

Fein, Rashi—Senior Staff Member for Economic Studies, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.;

Haynes, Dr. M. Alfred—Associate Professor of International Health, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health, Baltimore;

Helstein, Ralph—President, United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers, Chicago, Illinois;

Henderson, Dr. Vivian—President, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia;

Huerta, Dolores—Secretary, United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, Delano, California;

Kahn, Rabbi Robert—Congregation Emanu-El, Houston, Texas;

Mayer, Jean, M.D.—Professor of Nutrition, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts;

Mitchell, Walter—President, International Chemical Workers Union, Akron, Ohio;

O'Connor, Dr. James—President, American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, New York, New York;

Ogle, Milton—Executive Director, Appalachian Volunteers, Bristol, Tennessee;

Ortiz, Gilbert, M.D.—Chairman of ASPIRA, Bronx, New York;

Sorenson, Philip—Executive Director, Association of Foundations, Inc., Columbus, Indiana;

Sparer, Dr. Edward—Professor of Law, Columbia University, New York, New York;

Wheeler, Raymond, M.D.—Charlotte Medical Clinic, Charlotte, North Carolina.

[Reprinted from Harvard Business Review, May-June 1967]

CREATIVE COMPETITION

(By George Champion)

NOTE.—George Champion is Chairman of the Board of The Chase Manhattan Bank. Active for many years in civic and educational organizations, he is a director of a number of companies, including International Paper Company, American Smelting and Refining Company.

WORLD FOOD NEEDS

As the concept of social competition on a businesslike basis is extended to the international scene, it seems likely that private business can contribute effectively to solving the problem of feeding the world's hungry. It is becoming increasingly obvious that what countries with underdeveloped economies really want is self-sufficiency in food production along with the ability to produce agricultural products within the price range of their own low-income populations.

Some enterprising companies are demonstrating that private business can meet these requirements. They are introducing modified plantation schemes, directing and supervising credit, and pioneering in technical services and marketing arrangements. Companies already taking part in such sociocommercial projects include Anderson, Clayton and Company, California Packing Corporation, Campbell Soup Company, H. J. Heinz Company, Ralston Purina Company, Quaker Oats Company, Fisher Flour Mills, International Milling Company, Dole Corporation, and United Fruit Company.

Several of the more intriguing of these programs involve the processing and promoting of inexpensive but nourishing foods and animal feeds by American companies in overseas areas. For example:

Enriched Malzena is one product developed for the low-income, mass food market. Derived from a cornmeal product, it is produced and sold by the Corn Product Company of Latin America. Enriched with proteins, vitamins, and minerals, it is an all-purpose food that can be used as a pudding or a drink. While serving useful social purposes, it also sells well.

Another interesting project has been launched by Ralston Purina in Colombia. Recognizing an acute need for low-cost meat, milk, and eggs, the company decided to promote milo, a grain sorghum similar to Indian corn, as a suitable feed crop. Ralston introduced milo seed and financed local growers in Colombia by guaranteeing each a cash market for his harvest. The idea is that the increase in production in milo as a feed crop will in turn lead to the increased production of meat, milk, and eggs. Ralston Purina has also introduced improvements in local storage and transportation facilities and initiated consumer educational services.

The phrase "business know-how" has become a cliché, but there is no denying that, applied to social problems, it can be as effective and rewarding as it is in the normal run of commerce and industry.

CONGRESSMAN HANNA INTRODUCES PERFECTED TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, for the many who have been closely following the progress of the truth-in-lending legislation I want to report briefly on the nature of my perfecting amendments.

On September 14, I introduced H.R. 12904. After its introduction a number of perfecting technical changes were brought to my attention. Today I have introduced a clean bill which in substance incorporates the substantive material of H.R. 12904. The bill I have intro-

duced today (H.R. 13361) differs from the measure I introduced on September 14, in only two ways.

First, H.R. 13361 places banks and savings and loans under the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve, and Federal Home Loan Bank Board respectively in regards to the enforcement provisions of the advertising section of the bill. Previously, the Federal Trade Commission had full jurisdiction for all the enforcement under the advertising section of my bill.

Second, I have included in my perfected bill the language of the "administrative enforcement" section of H.R. 11601. The fact that this language was left out on the Senate side leads me to conclude that it was only the fault of oversight rather than intention. This language strengthens and generally perfects the intent of the truth-in-lending measure.

The other amendments which I have incorporated in H.R. 13361 technically perfect the language of the advertising sections, and the "add on" provision in H.R. 12904. None of these perfecting amendments materially change the substance of my approach toward the issue of truth in lending.

I commend H.R. 13361 to the careful attention of all who have been engaged in the dialog on this issue.

HANOI NOT INTERESTED IN PEACE TALKS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on September 27 the Honorable Paul Martin, Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, delivered a constructive and provocative address at the United Nations General Assembly.

The part of his speech which dealt with Vietnam attracted considerable attention, particularly in view of the fact that Canada is a member of the International Control Commission in Vietnam and that Canada has had sufficiently friendly contacts with Communist states, such as mainland China, so that Canada's views ought to be taken seriously in Hanoi.

While Mr. Martin called for a cessation of U.S. bombing of North Vietnam as "a matter of first priority" and as necessary if attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are to succeed, he also stated that a halt to the bombing was "only one side of a military equation, and that we cannot proceed if we are to have any hope of success as if the other side did not exist."

As one who has consistently urged that the United States stop bombing North Vietnam as a first step toward peace negotiations, I cannot help expressing dismay at the failure of the Hanoi regime to indicate any interest in even such a proposal as that made by the Canadian Government.

That part of Mr. Martin's address to the General Assembly which dealt with Vietnam follows:

VIETNAM

It would be encouraging, and indeed deeply gratifying to all of us at this United Nations General Assembly if we were able to note that the thunderclouds of war had lifted from Vietnam since one year ago we gathered in this same forum to review the problems of the world. That is not the case. The suffering and the destruction continue unabated. Despite all efforts, including those of my own country, to seek a basis for negotiation, the issues behind the conflict seem to remain as intractable as ever.

Once again we face the question, therefore, of whether this organization can help to bring the Vietnam conflict closer to a peaceful and mutually acceptable conclusion, and to foster political stability and economic progress in an area of the world where both are so badly needed.

There are, of course, reasons which militate against immediate and formal action being taken by the United Nations at this time. We cannot escape obvious fact—and it is a fact that I regret—that some of those most directly concerned with this conflict are not represented in this organization. I do not wish to suggest that if it were otherwise, we would automatically find ourselves closer to a concrete solution to the Vietnam problem. Whether this situation will change in the foreseeable future I cannot tell, but I do not believe that the efforts for peace need be held in abeyance until it does.

A second important reason for the inability of this organization to contribute constructively to a solution, is that great powers are divided on causes of conflict and on measures required to terminate it. As we all know, the Security Council can only function effectively if its members will unite their strength to maintain international peace and security as the Charter calls upon them to do. I can see no immediate prospect of this unity being found.

To be realistic in assessing our present ability to act collectively and as an organization must not be regarded as a justification for apathy and inertia by each of us individually. This, I think, has been the conviction of the Secretary General, who has made repeated efforts to find a solution. This has also been Canada's conviction. We must strive to bring into play whatever channels and whatever forms of peace seeking machinery may be available to the international community. Our goal must be the restoration of peace and making it secure. That surely was the overriding concern which gave birth to this organization. As members of the United Nations, partaking as we do of common objectives and obligations, I think we must register our concern in terms clear enough and unequivocal enough for all those directly involved in this conflict to hear and understand. And at the same time, we must work with all the resources of ingenuity, imagination, flexibility and above all with a sense of justice towards devising whatever means may be mutually acceptable for bringing the conflict in Vietnam to the conference table. Whether the path we select as the most direct route to that conference table bears a name derived from the Charter or from the Geneva Conference machinery matters less to my mind than our assessment of its likelihood of leading to an end to the war. For its part, the Canadian Government, which has a special interest and responsibility, because of Canada's membership in the International Control Commission, will as in the past, continue to explore all possibilities of making use of that Commission membership or acting in conjunction with its commission partners to try to lead the parties to the conflict towards negotiation.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the first step in that direction will involve the question of the bombing of North Vietnam. It seems clear that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped. This is a matter of first priority, if we are to start the process of de-escalation and to open the door to the conference room as the several representatives who have preceded me at this rostrum have pointed out.

But, let us not for a moment pretend that a halt to the bombing would in itself bring the war to an end. There are no magic formulas; there are no simple prescriptions for the settlement of problems as complex as the issues behind the hostilities in Vietnam. In a speech in Ottawa on April 11 of this year, I made certain suggestions as to how a start might be made on the road away from war by a progressive return to the ceasefire arrangement worked out at Geneva in 1954. I proposed that the following steps might be taken:

(1) As a first step towards disengagement the bombing of the north might be terminated and the demilitarized zone restored to its intended status, subject to effective international supervision;

(2) A freezing, of course, of military events and capabilities in Vietnam at the existing levels;

(3) Cessation of all hostilities between the parties that is a ceasefire;

(4) Following the ceasefire, withdrawal of all outside forces whose presence in the area of conflict was not provided for at Geneva and the dismantling of military bases.

I recognized then, as I have elsewhere, that there is no hope for progress towards a peaceful settlement in appeals or proposals which place the total burden of responsibility for making essential concessions on only one side. That sort of approach is relevant only in circumstances of military victory or defeat.

If therefore, we are to recognize a halt to the bombing for what it is, namely, the key to solution, the starting point in the process of solving the Vietnam problem, let us be very clear in our own minds that it is only one side of a military equation and that we cannot proceed if we are to have any hope of success as if the other side did not exist. No attempt to bring an end to the conflict can disregard either political or military inter-relationships in the area. Canada is, I repeat, ready at all times to accept its responsibilities in the International Control Commission—to act in conjunction with its commission partners in helping to lead parties to the conflict in Vietnam to the conference table and to assist in every way to achieve the establishment of an equitable peace in Vietnam.

WHO IS LEADING IN AVIATION SAFETY?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on September 30 I released what I consider to be 20 essential measures to promote aviation safety in the United States. One of these was development and use of an emergency runway barrier to prevent the crash of an airliner should the plane threaten to overrun a runway because of an aborted takeoff or some mishap upon landing.

Unhappily for airline crews and passengers, the attitude of the Federal Aviation Administration with respect to such an innovation, has been for years a negative one and unfortunately, certain representatives of the airline industry share this attitude. Some years ago, the FAA determined that the hook and cable arresting system similar to that used on aircraft carriers was not suitable for use at civilian airports. But rather than accept the idea that some kind of protection against runway overruns was necessary, the FAA let the matter rest. It did not pursue the development of any kind of barrier.

It is significant that the French Government has contracted to test such a barrier with a U.S. firm—the All American Engineering Co. of Wilmington, Del. The barrier to be tested is a nylon net that can be strung across a runway. I am hopeful, for the sake of all airline passengers and crews, that the testing is successful and I am equally hopeful that the FAA will abandon its negative attitude in regard to this innovation and require the use of such a barrier at all airports. If the FAA fails to take such action, it will have established yet another area in which it cannot pass the buck for needless deaths and injuries in aircraft accidents.

I present herewith for the RECORD, the New York Times article of October 6, announcing the contract between France and the All American Engineering Co.:
FRANCE WILL TEST A JET CRASH NET—RUNWAY BARRIER FOR CIVILIAN AIRPORTS TO BE SOUGHT

(By Edward Hudson)

The French Government has contracted for tests in the United States of an emergency runway barrier for civilian airports, the All American Engineering Company of Wilmington, Del., announced yesterday.

The barrier is a nylon net that can be rapidly strung across the end of a runway to prevent a plane in trouble from careening off. It is attached to energy absorbing devices that halt the plane. According to All American, the system can stop the largest four-engined jet airliner without discomfort to the passengers.

Emergency barriers and other types of aircraft-arresting devices have been in use by military forces here and abroad for many years. But, the company noted, the French Government is one of the first nations to take positive steps to adopt them at civilian airports.

The purpose of the barriers is to prevent possible injury to the occupants and damage to the plane in the event the plane threatens to run off the end of the runway because of an aborted take-off or a landing mishap.

One of the most disastrous overrun accidents occurred at Orly Airport in Paris on June 3, 1962, when an Air France Boeing 707 jet carrying an Atlanta art group sped off the runway during an attempted take-off and burned, killing 130 of the 132 persons aboard.

TESTING BY FAA

In this country the Federal Aviation Administration has tested the feasibility of a hook-and-cable arresting system for airliners but has never taken action to require such devices at civilian airports, an agency spokesman noted yesterday.

The spokesman said that officials of the agency believed that equivalent safety could be achieved at less cost by other means, such as grooving runway surfaces to increase aircraft braking power and improving thrust reversers for jet engines.

In the program announced yesterday, the French Ministry of Transportation has contracted for tests of a barrier system that employs a net made by a French concern, Aerazur Company, and an energy absorbing system built by All American.

The testing is to begin Oct. 16 and will be conducted over several months at All American's Georgetown, Del., facility using a framework that simulates a Boeing 707 jet and a high speed F.A.A. catapult.

The two companies have supplied similar barrier systems for the air forces of Switzerland and West Germany, for use with military aircraft.

The new system was reported to be capable of halting a four-engined jet aircraft traveling at take-off speed, without noticeable deceleration to passengers. Under the proposed system, the airport control tower operator could activate the emergency equipment that stretches safety net across the end of the runway.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the food stamp program, recently extended for 2 years, is, in the words of the Washington Post, "an ingenious method for multiplying the effective purchasing power" of the undernourished.

The President's food stamp program has proven itself by its success in filling the nutritional gap in the diets of millions of families. This accomplishment has been made with a minimum of red-tape and with a significant impact on local farm and grocery sales.

The food stamp program, originated by President Johnson and carried on by the Congress has, as the Post editorial says, proven a device "for ending the paradox of want in the midst of plenty, the anomaly of hunger in a land of abundance."

I place this editorial praising the President and the Congress in the RECORD at this point:

FOOD STAMPS CONTINUE

Under the law which Congress somewhat belatedly enacted, the food stamp plan will go forward for another two years with an appropriation of \$425 million. It would have been an extraordinary lapse of good sense and sound policy if the plan had not been continued.

It is an ingenious method for multiplying the effective purchasing power of people who are unable to obtain the food they require through ordinary marketing channels. It is no cure-all for the most impoverished, as the situation in Mississippi's backward areas demonstrated this year. Those at the very bottom of the ladder have difficulty finding the money needed to buy the stamps so they can use their multiplied purchasing power in stores.

Nevertheless, it has improved the diets of millions of families who need some help with food budgets. It has facilitated the movement of vast amounts of foodstuffs to deserving people without setting up the enormous bureaucracy that would be needed if government were to dole out rations through government distribution centers. There are no better devices at hand for ending the paradox of want in the midst of

plenty, the anomaly of hunger in a land of abundance.

EULOGY TO JEFF KIBRE, RESPECTED LABOR LEADER

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the passing on September 27, 1967, of veteran labor leader Jeff Kibre has stilled a dedicated and crusading voice in the American labor movement.

Prior to his retirement earlier this year due to ill health, Mr. Kibre had served the last 15 years of his life as the Washington representative of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. During his longtime service in Washington, he became well known on Capitol Hill as an expert in the transportation and maritime fields, in addition to all other aspects of law pertaining to organized labor.

Jeff was a most effective representative of the ILWU, highly respected in the Nation's Capital, and liked by all. He was a dear personal friend of mine and I shall miss him. The passing of this courageous champion of labor leaves a void in the labor movement that will not readily be filled.

As stated so meaningfully in a scroll of appreciation prepared for presentation to Mr. Kibre by the officers and executive board of the ILWU at its recent meeting in San Francisco—

Jeff Kibre's lifelong work is indelibly recorded in the historical growth of the American labor movement.

To Mrs. Kibre, and son, Joe, I extend my deepest condolences.

TESTIMONY OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS BEFORE U.S. VETERANS ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Cooper T. Holt, VFW executive director; Francis W. Stover, national legislative service director; and Norman D. Jones, national rehabilitation service director, on October 2 presented the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to the Veterans Advisory Commission. I found their views informative and helpful, and I believe other Members will also. I include the text of the VFW presentation at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE U.S. VETERANS ADVISORY COMMISSION, OCTOBER 2, 1967

It is a pleasure for me to be here today representing Joseph A. Scerra Commander-

in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Commander-in-Chief Scerra has asked me to express his regret at not being able to be present on this significant occasion.

Fulfillment of the purpose for which this Advisory Commission was established can and must open up a new era of progress in the field of veterans benefits and programs.

This Commission was not established for the purpose of reducing the scope of present programs for the veteran. Nevertheless, it is understandable that there should have been some concern that a review, such as the one you have undertaken, might serve as a preliminary to the reduction of veterans programs. I know that the members of this Commission do not see their task in this light. I think we are all agreed that the primary purpose of this work, whatever specifics may ultimately emerge, is to further the interests of our veterans.

With this point made, it is possible to go on to a consideration of whatever additions or changes may be necessary to improve the substance and the servicing of veterans programs. You have made a substantial beginning toward this goal by making it possible for veterans, as members of our veterans organizations and as individuals, to present their views on what is necessary in order to go forward with this tremendous task.

As a representative of the National Organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I wish to congratulate members of the Commission for taking the time to go to the veteran in order to determine current needs and aspirations. When you have completed these hearings, however, the real task will still be before you. Certainly your major contribution will be in sorting out the suggestions and recommendations made to you from which you must point the way. With this done, it will be the task of the Congress, the Executive and the veterans organizations to develop the legislative proposals and administrative innovations and procedures that we all expect shall result from your work.

Mr. Francis W. Stover, Director of the V.F.W. National Legislative Service, and Mr. Norman D. Jones, Director of the V.F.W. National Rehabilitation Service, are present with me here today and will detail the improvements we foresee as necessary and possible in order that we may fully translate the will of the people of this great Nation that our veterans shall be honored and their needs and the needs of their widows and children shall be met.

You will appreciate that down through the years the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has generally been determined by the resolutions adopted at our annual National Conventions.

Accordingly, recommendations made in this statement reflects to a large degree the almost 300 resolutions which were adopted at our most recent convention, which was held in New Orleans, Louisiana August 18 to 26, 1967.

All who have experience with legislation with the Congress do not have to be reminded that the Bureau of the Budget is the big roadblock which thwarts the dreams of so many. Veterans programs have for many years remained fairly constant while during the same period the cost of living, the gross national product, and other indexes of our economic prosperity have sharply increased. The so-called national "budget pie" indicates that the cost of veterans programs has sharply decreased on a proportionate basis. This fiscal year of 1968—the cost of veterans programs is approximately 4.5¢ of the budget dollar as opposed to 6 or 7¢ a few years ago.

As you make your considerations—keep in mind the modest cost of veterans programs. Remember other segments of our society do not hesitate to make huge demands for assistance to citizens whose contribution to our society has in so many instances been on

the negative side. Veterans have made a special contribution by wearing the uniform and receiving an honorable discharge, and, therefore, deserve special consideration by the Government it defended in a time of peril. Do not be timid, therefore, in your recommendations because of the cost. Let your guide be as the President so eloquently stated in his message on veterans "that our Government is meeting fully its responsibilities to all those to whom we owe so much."

In the development of veterans programs, a most significant milestone was reached with the signing of Public Law 90-77. Since August 5, 1964 and on into the indefinite future, every person who serves in the Armed Forces of the United States will be a veteran upon his discharge or release from the Armed Forces.

Even today, 94 million or almost 50% of the total American population of now close to 200 million represent veterans and their families. With the signing of Public Law 90-77, veterans and their families will increase and continue to become a more significant percentage of the American population.

Public Law 90-77 has probably signaled the end of what is referred to as peace-time service. From now on, unless there is a drastic change in international events, all military service will probably be considered equivalent to wartime service for the purpose of veterans benefits. We hope that Vietnam is the last conflict to be recognized as equivalent to wartime service, but unfortunately this optimistic view is shared by few.

Any and all recommendations, therefore, that you may make to the Veterans Administrator will have a profound, long-lasting effect—not only on existing programs but perhaps for generations of veterans to come. For this reason alone you are urged to give very careful consideration to each and every recommendation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which it is our conviction are much needed and will greatly improve the present structure of veterans programs.

COMPENSATION

It has often been stated that the service connected disabled or, if deceased, their survivors deserve the highest consideration. Congress has generally adhered to this principle and since the end of World War II there has been a dramatic increase in the compensation to disabled veterans. Nevertheless, it is our considered opinion that compensation payments have not kept up with the vastly improved American way of life; for example, a 100% service connected veteran receives \$300 a month or \$3600 a year. This contrasts to the average American hourly wage earner who is now receiving in the vicinity of \$5000 a year, or the average American family, whose income, depending on different criteria, is in the neighborhood of from \$6000 to \$7500 a year. These figures are subject to change but they demonstrate that the veteran with a service connected disability has somehow lagged far behind in his compensation payments when compared to the standard of living being enjoyed by the average American of the same age or status.

Probably the root cause of this development is the take-off point of \$100 a month, which was the total disability payment to a veteran when World War II ended in 1945. Cost of living increases have been granted on a periodic basis to veterans receiving compensation, but this has not been enough.

It is recommended, therefore, that service connected disability compensation payments should be substantially increased and brought in line with the standard of living which is being enjoyed by the average American family.

This should not be construed as recommending an economic determination for disability compensation. The Veterans of Foreign Wars has always favored the larger

payments to the more seriously service disabled. This continues to be our position.

Lastly, it should be remembered that many veterans have made miraculous recoveries and rehabilitation—not because of their disability but in spite of their disability—and they should not be penalized for having had the grit and determination to overcome their handicaps only to have their compensation payments reduced accordingly.

DIC PAYMENTS

The DIC payments are somewhat in the same category as the compensation payments. First established in 1956, the DIC payments have been improved since that time, so that the basic payment is now \$120 a month to a widow. Coupled with the veteran's rank, the minimum to a widow is generally around \$131—ranging on upwards to \$361 a month for a high ranking officer with more than 30 years' service.

Most of those receiving DIC payments are widows who have been on the rolls for many years. It should be remembered that had these veterans lived they would be earning on the average of a much greater amount than \$131 a month or whatever the figure might be.

It would seem appropriate, therefore, that a reevaluation of the DIC schedule should be made, with sufficient weight being given to the length of time that a widow had been receiving a pension, with due regard to her age and other factors which may be pertinent. An increased graduated DIC payment based on the length of time a widow is receiving DIC should be a part of the DIC program. For example, a widow of 20 years of age should not receive the same DIC payment as a widow of 60 who has been receiving DIC payments for 40 years.

One of the factors which is incorporated in the DIC payments is theoretically the equivalent of a free \$10,000 life insurance policy. Notwithstanding, the Congress has provided an additional \$10,000 life insurance policy to all those who have served in the Armed Forces since 1965 through its authorization of the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance policies. Consequently, any reevaluation of the DIC program must take into account the SGLI program. Further, the President has recommended that SGLI be increased from a minimum of \$12,000 coverage to a maximum of \$30,000 depending on the rank of the serviceman.

It is the considered judgment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the DIC program should also consider another factor. Upon remarriage, a widow forfeits her right to any more DIC payments. This in itself is an inequity. Most programs call for a lump sum settlement or payment when a guaranteed life income is terminated. It is recommended, therefore, that when a widow is remarried that she be provided a settlement payment which will take into account the age of the widow at the time of her remarriage and the amount of the DIC payments she would have received had she lived out her life expectancy without remarriage.

There is a precedent for this. The Federal Bureau of Employees Compensation provides a 24 month payment when a widow remarries. Present VA policy serves to deter or bar a widow from being remarried. A lump sum payment recognizes that a great saving has insured to the benefit of the Government. The DIC program should have the same principle and provision.

PENSION

The pension program is the most misunderstood of all veterans' programs. It is also the most political and Congress has received more heat over this program than any other since the end of World War II.

Today there are three pension programs: One for Spanish-American war veterans and their widows and prior wars, one for old law pensions and their widows, and one for new

law or Public Law 86-211 cases, which has been in effect since July 1, 1960.

Presently, the Congress is considering restructuring the pension program to insure that there will be little or no decrease in pension payments when retirement and other types of income are increased. This year in Public Law 90-77, the Congress has approved a 5.4% cost of living increase, amounting to almost \$100 million for those who are presently entitled to a pension payment.

The complicating development during the past several years has been the existence side by side of two pension programs—the old and the new. It was the studied opinion of the Congress when it approved Public Law 86-211 that the new pension program should be so liberal that eventually most of those receiving a pension under the old program would be phased out of the picture because of the more generous benefits under Public Law 86-211. This has not proven true. There are hundreds of thousands of veterans who are still under the old pension program and apparently will remain so as long as they live.

It is the recommendation, therefore, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that there should be substantial increases in both the income limitations and the pension payments for those under the old pension program; for example, the Congress has provided a housebound allowance of \$100 a month for those under the old pension program. It is our recommendation that the present aid and attendance allowance for the relatively few under the old pension program should be brought in line in the same amount as is paid under Public Law 86-211.

If it is in the wisdom of the Congress to restructure the new pension program along the lines of H.R. 12555—then the old pension program should be structured in the same manner. The President recommended—and the Congress has agreed—not to have any veteran suffer a loss in his aggregate income because of the Social Security increase. The refinements in the income limitations for the old pension program should be spelled out in the same manner as the refinements in H.R. 12555.

Further—for the consideration of this Commission is that old pension program cases be given a protected rating in much the same manner as compensation cases are protected under the Rating Schedules of 1925 and 1933, by guaranteeing at least \$78.75 a month for the rest of their lives but with the opportunity to receive a higher amount should their income warrant. This would make the pension program much simpler and easier to explain.

What we are advocating is that those who are presently receiving a pension under the old program would have their pension payment protected so that in no event would they ever go below \$78.75; then—if one of his neighbors comes along at a later date and does not receive as much because of a greater income, the situation could be explained—that his neighbor under the old program has a protected rating under an obsolete and ancient law.

Presently, a veteran with no dependents is guaranteed an income of \$1248 a year. Obviously this is not enough for such a person to exist. The veteran must get additional assistance from other sources. It is the recommendation, therefore, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that there be a substantial increase in the pension payments, especially for those with little or no income. Veterans who have worn the uniform have made a special contribution to their Nation in time of great peril, and it is the obligation of this Nation that these veterans can live in dignity during their declining years. This principle can best be carried out by making the pension program generous enough to provide the veteran with the basic necessities of life. Whatever amount of money this is estimated to be

should be the minimum amount of pension paid to a veteran on a monthly basis for each year.

The payment of pensions to widows is a relatively recent development. Where veterans have been paid pensions down through the years since the founding of this Republic, it has only been in fairly recent times that pensions have been authorized for widows of veterans who have died from non-service connected disabilities; in fact, it was only since 1960 that the widows of World War II veterans have been paid a pension, where a veteran did not have any compensable service connected disability.

Consequently, the pension payments for widows has trailed in the amount of pension paid to the living veteran. However, the recently-enacted Public Law 90-77 has provided a new benefit—namely, an aid and attendance allowance, where a widow is so helpless that she needs the aid and attendance of another person. Thus, the Congress recognized that many of these widows are extremely elderly and in a helpless condition and has authorized additional assistance for them. With this policy, the Veterans of Foreign Wars wholeheartedly agrees.

It is recommended that the payments to widows be substantially increased with particular attention and consideration being given to those who have health problems or otherwise housebound or cut off from society because of their physical condition and age. Again, those with the least amount of income should be given a substantial increase to guarantee that these widows can at least be provided with the basic necessities of life.

MEDICAL CARE AND TREATMENT

Unhappily, something is happening in our VA hospitals. During the last several years the waiting lists for admission have drastically declined. The average daily patient load has drastically declined. Although the Congress has authorized a maximum of 125,000 VA hospital beds, only about 115,000 are in operation. Even the new hospitals do not have all of the beds in operation.

Military retirees are now permitted treatment at VA hospitals, provided a bed is available, as a matter of right. Post-Korean veterans are eligible for VA hospital care. On the other hand, Medicare has been made available to veterans who are 65 or older.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars believes that every effort should be made to have VA hospitals provide the same high standard of care which is being provided by university type hospitals and medical centers. There are alarming reports the quality of VA care has not been keeping up. To do this enough money has to be obtained through the budgetary process. It is strongly recommended that a much larger amount of money be provided the VA hospital system—to be sure that the latest type of hospital equipment is being obtained—and that the salaries for medical personnel are sufficiently attractive for the VA to recruit and retain the finest medical personnel. We can do no less for the veterans of this Nation.

Lastly, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has always strongly opposed the pauper's oath. With more VA beds becoming available, perhaps it would be feasible to liberalize this restriction and make it easier for more veterans to seek treatment at VA hospitals. This should not be construed as opening up the hospitals for all veterans regardless of their ability to pay, but to more liberally interpret existing law with respect to the inability to defray the cost of hospitalization as it applies to the individual veteran.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The most revolutionary development in veterans' programs, which occurred during World War II, was the enactment of the GI Bill. Instead of waiting until the veteran was disabled, the Congress decided to give the veteran help at the very beginning of his

return to civil life. The success of the GI Bills is without parallel. The training provided under these programs will be a most significant factor in making it unnecessary for help and assistance to most of these veterans in later years.

Nevertheless, the post-Korean veteran is not being provided the same assistance as was provided to those in the Korean War. The formula for entitlement is based upon one day of training for each day of service. In the Korean conflict and World War II, it was a day and a half training for each day of service.

Likewise, the maximum of 36 months for World War II veterans established in 1944 still holds true for Vietnam veterans. There has been an educational revolution in this country during the last 20 years. In many instances 36 months of training will not do the trick—is not sufficient to complete the training of a veteran. It is recommended, therefore, that the Congress provide a day and a half of training for each day of service, where the maximum entitlement for education and training will be 48 months. This would simply be bringing the education and training program in line with present day requirements for many occupations and professions which require a long period of training and study.

CEMETERIES

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has long argued that there should be a national cemetery in every State in the Union. One of the problems is the many agencies which have responsibility for veterans cemeteries. Another reason is the way cemetery legislation is handled in the Congress, where it is divided among several committees.

Burial in a national cemetery is basically a veteran's benefit. The right to be buried is determined upon service in the Armed Forces. Consequently, it is recommended that the operation of national cemeteries be transferred to the Veterans Administration.

More basically—it is recommended that all legislation dealing with national cemeteries be transferred from the Interior Committee in the Congress to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House and hopefully the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which will be established one day in the Senate.

GI LOANS

The FHA program has a permanent loan program. When a loan is paid off, then the borrower can take out another loan. It is a permanent program.

The Veterans Administration presently operates one of the largest loan programs in the Nation. Why should we let this experience and know-how go down the drain as these loans are retired? Ours is a mobile nation. Veterans are on the move and for this and many other reasons many will purchase more than one home during their lifetime.

Assuming that the veteran has paid off his first loan, it is recommended that he be granted another GI loan and as many other GI loans as he is qualified for, provided previous loans have all been paid. The GI loan program should be a permanent one.

REOPEN NSLI

It is astounding to many that only a small proportion of veterans have retained their National Service Life Insurance. For many reasons veterans permitted their NSLI policies to lapse shortly after their service during World War II. Then practically without notice, the Congress terminated the program in the early 1950's.

After many abortive attempts to reopen the program the Congress did approve a limited reopening for the service disabled and a few others. Many have lamented the fact that not as many as was anticipated took advantage of this opportunity to reopen.

Notwithstanding, it is the conviction of

the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the NSLI Program should be reopened and that in no event should the service connected disability of a veteran serve as a bar to the granting of NSLI nor should it serve as a basis for higher premium payments.

HEALTH SERVICES

No explanation offered by the Veterans Administration justifies the drastic reduction in the total waiting list for hospital treatment in recent years. The number has reduced from 25,312 in 1950 to 7,715 in 1967. Factors undermining the logic of such reduction are the increased number of veterans and the increased incidence of hospitalization associated with advancing age. Factors which tend to reduce the waiting list are the intensified outplacement program, the pre-bed-care program, and improved treatment techniques which result in shorter length of stay and increased turnover rates.

The average rejection rate of applications for admission to VA hospitals is now approximately 35 per cent. There is no basis whatsoever for presuming that 35 per cent or at some hospitals as high as 50 per cent of veterans who apply for admission do not need hospital treatment. Many of the applicants who were rejected on the grounds of absence of medical need were recommended strongly for admission by their private physicians.

Improper medical school influence is evident at several facilities notwithstanding official denial by Veterans Administration spokesmen. Candid comments of hospital directors submitted anonymously to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives support this opinion, and, in fact, clearly indicate numerous hospitals are in the unyielding grasp of the affiliated medical schools. The Administrator of Veterans Affairs should in these instances immediately reestablish the independence of VA hospitals as part of a system maintained for the sole purpose of providing treatment for eligible veterans.

Officials of some VA hospitals do not look with favor on maintenance of waiting lists, which are considered to be an administrative nuisance. The inability to immediately admit a veteran whose condition is not emergent may affect the judgment as to need for hospitalization. A legally eligible applicant who needs hospitalization should of course be promptly admitted or his name placed on the waiting list and admission accomplished at the earliest appropriate time.

The outplacement program, recently circumscribed by the blanket term of "Community Care Program", includes placement in nursing homes at VA expense and placement of veteran patients in many types of facilities at personal, family or welfare expense. The utilization of private nursing homes is disappointing. A proud proclamation by VA spokesmen that contracts have been negotiated with more than 2300 private nursing homes with a total capacity of more than 163,000 beds is unconvincing when compared to the current number of slightly in excess of 3000 patients cared for in private nursing homes at VA expense. Although the maximum payment for such care should be increased, and the six months restriction eliminated or grossly extended to facilitate the expanded utilization of this program, it is nevertheless evident that undue caution is partially the cause of such sparing use of contract nursing homes.

It is indeed unfortunate that caution has not been applied to the greatly expanded program of outplacement of mental patients. It was originally called The Foster Home Program. The types of facilities now utilized are of such varied often nondescript characteristics that the new term "community care facilities" is the terminology shield for all types of facilities utilized for post-hospital-care of mental patients. The desirability of

timely and satisfactory outplacement of mental patients is conceded and supported. Nevertheless this interest should not result in placement in foster homes or other facilities of inadequate size or improper characteristics with respect to quarters, food service, supervision, patient activities or other important factors. Gross discrepancies in this program have been forcibly presented to the Veterans Administration. Corrective action to date is in our opinion inadequate. Statutory authorization permitting the Veterans Administration to pay for post-hospital-care of mentally ill patients would doubtless result in establishment of standards by the Veterans Administration and greatly improve the average quality of the facilities utilized for this purpose.

The reluctance of officials of the Department of Medicine and Surgery to candidly concede discrepancies is unfortunate. There is no place for a defensive mechanism in the operation of a system established and operated for the purpose of treatment of patients. In numerous instances responses to reports and communications have firmly denied existence of the reported conditions or claimed them to be inconsequential and to have been fully corrected. Persistent rebuttal have been necessary to obtain admissions of the gross faults reported. Administration officials should welcome rather than rebuff reports of policies, procedures, attitudes and judgment obviously inconsistent with professional and administrative standards.

Recognizing the probable impact of recent court decisions barring conviction and/or incarceration for alcoholism and the relative universal acceptance of classification of alcoholism as a disease, the Veterans Administration should initiate a crash program to establish more treatment centers for alcoholism in selected VA hospitals.

Inadequate professional staffing of some VA hospitals is alarming. This is particularly true with respect to psychiatry and other specialties. There is no single complete and guaranteed remedy for this condition. However, drastically increased maximum salary rates as high as \$35,000 to \$40,000 per annum for specialists, with related appropriation increases, would be of notable assistance in this regard. Authorization of what are commonly called fringe benefits, such as housing, salary differentials, increased opportunities for further professional training, and other benefits to be granted selectively by the Administrator would also be of assistance in recruitment.

The reduced appropriations for construction the last two fiscal years has assuredly detrimentally affected progress of modernization and replacement programs. Veterans Administration spokesmen have stated that the amount of \$52,000,000 per year is adequate and all that can be utilized effectively but obviously this statement is inconsistent with the higher amounts originally requested by the agency. Even the higher amounts appropriated for a number of years were not adequate for all the projects needed to modernize and prevent deterioration of VA facilities. Certainly this subject merits immediate attention. It would indeed be unfortunate for the reduced appropriation rate to be continued for each of the next several years and allow VA hospitals to deteriorate to the dilapidated condition evident in the last decade before the modernization program was approved.

The value of VA hospital patients and domiciliary members as a clinical reservoir for research and training is recognized. Affiliation of a number of VA hospitals with outstanding medical schools for the purpose of cooperatively furthering the objective of improving and increasing the opportunities for professional training is proper. However, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs and his advisors in this important area of respon-

sibility should not deviate from the purpose of providing hospital care for veterans reasonably convenient to their areas of residence throughout the country.

The discrimination which would result from further centralization of Veterans Administration Hospitals in the large urban centers near medical schools can not be tolerated. Additional smaller hospitals should be constructed in selected areas of the country. Authorization for reciprocal utilization of resources with other hospitals negates the old and invalid argument that smaller hospitals should not be operated because they cannot provide treatment for all conditions. Certainly they can be equipped and staffed to furnish treatment for more than 90 per cent of the applicants and patients. Transfer of a small number of patients or applicants to other facilities is not uncommon even between large Veterans Administration hospitals. The Veterans Administration hospital system should be structured, including geographical distribution of facilities, and operated for the treatment of veterans within reasonable geographical convenience.

It is probably impossible to accurately predict future VA hospital bed needs. Nonetheless, it is irrefutable that the dramatic increase in the number of eligible veterans resulting from recent legislation, the significant number added to the eligibility pool annually, and the increasing age of veterans, will increase the demand for VA hospitalization in future decades. The capacity of the system must not be inexorably reduced by annual reassessment, as seems to be the current pattern, with associated timidity in planning for the future. Forecasts and planning and construction should be based on generous estimates of projected patient loads to assure that adequate facilities will be available at all times.

The oath of inability to pay is of itself detestable and an insult to veterans who have served their country. It is amazing that the Veterans Administration, which as an agency should administer the laws designed to benefit veterans, their dependents, and survivors fairly and with compassion, would, by utilizing the authority of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to interpret laws and establish rules and procedures, instigate a coercive procedure innocently called hospital admission counseling. Even if it were possible to concede that the counseling program is administered as intended in all facilities it nevertheless must be recognized as an unwarranted restriction of the veterans right of free decision. The number of cases identified for special review and appropriate action is negligible. The monetary equivalent of personnel time involved doubtless exceeds the amount recovered manyfold. Some veterans have withdrawn their applications during the course of or as a result of intensive counseling because of the fear incited by pointed remarks and questioning of the counselors. This program should be immediately discontinued.

It is generally agreed that it is desirable to increase state participation in the various care and treatment programs for veterans. An increase in the payment rates to state homes to \$4.00 per day for domiciliary care, \$6.00 per day for skilled nursing care, and \$12.00 per day for hospital care, with a limitation in each instance of 50 per cent of the per capita operating expenditures of the state home, would doubtless be of benefit in improving quality of state provided care and encouraging states to increase the capacity of their facilities.

The 5-year period for federal financial assistance for construction of state nursing home care facilities should be extended for a second 5-year period with annual appropriations based on anticipated or known valid state requests. Inducement for states to establish state veterans homes or to increase the facilities thereof would be greatly en-

hanced by extension of the program of financial assistance for construction to include facilities for domiciliary care and for hospital treatment. For states which do not now have state veterans homes such assistance could properly be extended to include all commonly recognized essential facilities, including administrative headquarters, utilities, and all necessary adjunct structures.

We believe that the Administrator of Veterans Affairs and the Congress of the United States should reaffirm the importance of the domiciliary program as the most appropriate device for providing care for veterans not requiring hospitalization or skilled nursing care. The domiciliary admission criteria restrictively amended in 1955 should be reviewed and liberalized. Additional relatively small domiciliaries should be established at appropriate locations, perhaps associated with hospitals, throughout the country.

The statutory provision requiring that patients be transferred to contract nursing homes from VA hospitals and the administrative stipulation that admissions to VA nursing care units be limited to hospitalized patients discriminates against veterans who need definitely, even desperately, skilled nursing care but who do not require hospital treatment and therefore are denied or would be denied admission to VA hospitals, the current prerequisite for care in a VA nursing care unit or in a contract nursing care facility. It is recommended that direct admission to both types of facilities be permitted. VA hospital and clinical facilities and professional staff could be utilized in evaluating the need and appropriateness of skilled nursing care. In areas relatively remote from VA hospitals or clinics the VA could rely on selected private practitioners for this purpose.

INDEBTEDNESS

The financial distress associated with repayment of indebtedness to the Veterans Administration should be alleviated by administrative or legislative remedies. Harshness of judgment as to the question of extreme hardship is, in our opinion, apparent in many cases. Failure of the VA officials to correctly interpret the amendment to Title 38, U.S. Code, accomplished by P.L. 88-151 which in effect provides that with respect to G.I. loan indebtedness recovery shall not be effected if the veteran was without fault or repayment would cause extreme hardship is reprehensible. This language is certainly not ambiguous and the proper interpretation is clearly apparent. VA officials are apparently unduly disturbed by the possibility that a correct interpretation might result in an occasional waiver even though repayment by the veteran might be accomplished without extreme financial hardship. It is incomprehensible that this rare possibility should alter the proper interpretation and application of a statutory remedy.

It is, however, conceded that the best remedy is not within current statutory authority. It is believed that legislation according the Administrator of Veterans Affairs authority to waive any overpayment or indebtedness to the VA if recovery would be against equity and good conscience would be the most suitable vehicle. This would preclude specific findings related to fault and hardship although both factors might be considered in general evaluation of the petition for redress.

In the area of GI loan indebtedness it is believed that it would be appropriate to initiate changes which would eliminate the basis for indebtedness in many cases. An upset price at the time of the sale of the property by the veteran would be appropriate. Instigation of an effective procedure which would assure that each veteran proposing to sell his property involving a VA direct or guaranteed loan, request for release of liability or state in writing that he does not wish to do so would in the future minimize

the number of cases in which veterans are obligated as a result of subsequent defaults and deficiencies resulting in obligation to pay the VA the amount of indemnity disbursed by that agency.

The VA should arrange for availability of mortgage credit insurance on a group basis for VA insured and direct loans. This would insure reasonable rates and acceptance of each concerned veteran without the necessity of meeting commercial life insurance health standards. It would also alleviate the problem of major indebtedness associated with the event of death and frequently minimal income of the survivors, and would, therefore, eliminate the possibility of indebtedness to the VA resulting from unavoidable default in such cases.

ECONOMIC VALIDATION OF THE VA SCHEDULE FOR RATING DISABILITIES

The economic validation project has been in process for several years. It will probably not be consummated before the expiration of an additional period of at least 2 years. This study of the average impairment caused by specific severity levels of diagnostic entities is being conducted in a period of economic virility. Job opportunities for many of the severely handicapped would not exist in average economic conditions or during a substantial recession or depression. We believe the VA to be in error in this project in not according an appropriate weight factor in evaluating the average economic impairment, particularly of severe disabilities. In response to our suggestion the Administrator stated that if the economic situation changes substantially an appropriate review would again be conducted. The length of time required for a comprehensive study of this nature precludes acceptance of this statement as an appropriate reaction to our suggestion.

The revision of the Rating Schedule should also provide for additional compensation for reduced life expectancy and social inadaptability.

BOARD OF VETERANS APPEALS

The case load of the Board of Veterans Appeals precludes adequate consideration of the individual claims and questions by members of the sections assigned responsibility as members of the Board. Each 3-member section is responsible for approximately 8 cases per day. Obviously, time does not permit the members to thoroughly review the evidence in all cases and direct preparation of each decision outlining the basis therefor; consequently, proposed decisions are prepared by consultants with board review of the cases after preparation of suggested decisions. An adequate number of additional board members should be authorized and employed to insure initial review of the evidence and decision determinations prior to referral to consultants for decision preparation.

Each adverse VA decision, including decisions related to VA administered insurance or Servicemen's Group Life Insurance, should be subject to appellate consideration by the Board of Veterans Appeals. Only decisions as to need for and type and extent of treatment should be excepted.

MILITARY PAYMENTS TO VA BENEFITS AND EFFECT OF CHARACTER OF RELEASE FROM ACTIVE DUTY

Veterans receiving military longevity retirement may not also concurrently receive VA disability compensation or disability pension. This is obviously inequitable as such military retirement pay is based on length of service and not on disability. The authority to waive retirement pay and receive disability compensation or disability pension is not appropriate. Full payment of both military longevity retirement and VA disability compensation or disability pension should be authorized.

Recoupment of disability severance pay by offset of VA disability compensation should be computed from the date of release from active military duty irrespective of delay in

filing a VA claim or in the effective date of VA benefits.

Present law requires recoupment of 75 per cent of military readjustment pay from VA disability benefits even though such readjustment pay has no legal or technical relationship to disability. This recoupment requirement should be abolished.

In some cases the character of final release from active duty bars authorization of VA administered benefits even though the individual served a period of many years, perhaps more than 15 years, and served with honor and distinction during one and perhaps two wars. The rule is premised on the fact that at the time of all status changes, such as reenlistment during the last continuous period of service, the individual was not free to be released from active duty on those specific dates. This policy is manifestly unfair. Benefits should be authorized based on satisfactory performance of wartime service without regard to character of subsequent release from extended service initiated by reenlistment or other change of status.

VETERANS FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE PREFERENCE

Opponents of veterans Civil Service preference in federal employment have been unsuccessful in their efforts to persuade the Congress of the United States to adversely amend this beneficial legislation. The arguments have included the premise that special preference for veterans precludes selection of the most qualified applicant in some instances, and because the majority of veterans are beyond the normal age of seeking employment, the program has served its purpose and should be abolished.

Relatively recently initiated programs which provide special consideration for members of certain groups in some segments of federal employment negate veterans preference. All positions for which veterans preference applies should be filled through processes which insure appropriate consideration of applicants entitled to such preference. Favored consideration of other applicants pursuant to the terms of special programs established by administrative fiat circumvent the intent of Congress and the provisions of the Veterans Civil Service Preference Act.

Any degree of success of attacks on veterans preference will result in renewed attacks on the basic merit system. We believe it important that the Veterans Advisory Commission proclaim the importance and justification of special consideration of veterans and entitled dependents and survivors who seek employment in the federal system.

JOB COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT SERVICE

Reports of inadequate personnel to provide the preferred service to veterans prescribed by law at many local public employment service offices are distressing. The many special emphasis programs have placed an almost insurmountable burden on the public employment service, and personnel at many locations is inadequate for all of the assigned tasks.

Effective job counselling and placement service for veterans must be assured by adequate public employment service personnel, unquestioned sufficiency of time for each Veterans Employment Representative to perform his functional supervisory responsibilities, and adequate appropriations for the employment service and for the veterans employment service.

CONCLUSION

We urge adequate studies by or at the direction of the Commission of these recommendations and evaluation of each recommendation as to appropriate commission action. A study of Veterans Benefits conducted by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs through the medium of the Veterans Advisory Commission is as the President stated, to be conducted in consultation with leading

veterans groups. It is manifestly inappropriate, therefore, for the Commission to proceed to formulate its final report without devoting adequate time to the study and consideration of the recommendations of national spokesmen of veterans organizations.

We recognize the Commission's expressed primary interest in subjects requiring legislation. We believe it appropriate, however, for the Commission to act with regard to recommendations not necessarily requiring legislation which ostensibly require remedial action. In some instances expression of concern by the Commission may be adequate. With respect to other situations the Commission might appropriately urge the concerned agency head to conduct studies and instigate appropriate corrective action or promulgate a statement of intent or declaration of policy which would accord some assurance of sympathetic consideration of the subjects in question.

We trust that the import of the projected monetary cost of the recommendations for new or liberalized benefits does not deter you from including all substantial recommendations of merit. We recognize the monetary consideration may affect the timeliness of legislative enactment of some of the recommendations and in consideration of this possibility you may wish to suggest a program of implementation of the Commission's recommendations.

We shall be pleased to respond to questions of the Commission members and to furnish further explanatory information upon request.

We again express our appreciation for the privilege of presenting testimony to this distinguished panel.

Thank you.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 31, 1967.

HON. CHARLES L. SCHULTZ,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHULTZ: I am writing to register the strongest possible protest against the practice of the Bureau of the Budget in distorting the impact of veterans programs on governmental expenditures. This distortion, unfortunately, is consistent with a protracted and insidious campaign to undermine veterans programs.

A graphic prepared by the Bureau of the Budget widely reproduced in the press illustrates this. Examples from *The Evening Star* of January 24, 1967, and *Labor* of January 28, 1967, are enclosed [graphs do not appear in Record]. The effect of this graphic is to seriously misrepresent the cost of veterans programs.

The "pie" would indicate that the cost of veterans benefits is a significant portion of the 33 cents of the dollar cost of government charged to "Interest, Veterans, Other Fixed Charges." This is not true. The veterans portion of this 33 cent slice of the pie is only one-tenth of this total, or 3.3 cents. Interest charges amount to 10.5 cents of the 33 cent figure. Contractual obligations amount to 11.5 cents and public assistance grants amount to 3.1 cents of the 33 cent slice. It is a gross distortion of the facts to single out veterans in your presentation.

What happens is shown vividly in the reproduction of a portion of the front page of *The Evening Star* of January 24. The photograph used by *The Evening Star* cannot help but leave the impression that veterans costs bulk extremely large in the costs of government. Such costs are substantial but the proper perspective must be maintained. We suggest that in the future your depiction of the budget dollar be changed to delete the term "Interest, Veterans, Other Fixed Charges" and to substitute "Contractual Obligations, Interest, Other Fixed Charges."

Let the actual figures tell their own story of the costs of meeting the Nation's obligations to its veterans.

Sincerely yours,

LESLIE M. FRY,
Commander in Chief.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1967.

MR. LESLIE M. FRY,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign
Wars of the United States, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. FRY: I've taken a long, hard look at that chart, and I can see your point. The fiscal and graphic motives were right, but the impact was obviously wrong. Our purpose was not to single out veterans, in some invidious sense, but to find a label that had concrete meaning in a few short words. In any event, we'll have a more careful reading of our graphics next year. You know, of course, that in the regular 1968 budget publications, such as "The Budget in Brief" and "The Budget," veterans' benefits are listed separately in chart.

I am sorry this reply has been so long delayed, but your letter of January 21 was being held for my personal attention.

Cordially,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZ,
Director.

DEVELOP BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT IN SMALLER CITIES AND AREAS OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT BY PROVIDING CERTAIN PREFERENCES FOR PROSPECTIVE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS IN SUCH CITIES AND AREAS

MR. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

MR. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the long, hot summer's agony has called forth new and creative approaches to our urban problems. We now know that we can no longer consider urban problems in isolation from rural problems and the problems of the small city. Congressmen from areas of low density must join with their colleagues from megalopolis to bring about a workable urban-rural balance.

A little more than a month ago, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced a midwinter conference to brainstorm what he described as one of the most urgent problems of our time:

Should we try to check the accelerating movement of people from country to city?

Should we give high priority to building up smaller cities and creating new cities or should we resign ourselves to the kind of concentration we have increasingly today with 70 percent of the people now living on 1 percent of the land? I believe that it is time to come to grips with these questions.

We are all familiar with the growing problems of large cities. Nearly 600,000 people flow into our major cities each year, many without the skills for urban living, many who become a floating population among unfamiliar modes of life.

But even these nationwide urban growth statistics do not tell the whole story because growth is uneven. Eighty-four percent of our population increase is occurring within metropolitan areas. We now recognize the familiar pattern of the influx of low-income persons into the center city, the migration of higher income persons to the suburbs, the chaotic and unplanned growth of both city and suburb, the stagnation of small towns in the rural countryside—particularly in the Deep South. While the suburb strains to build new roads and provide sewers and schools, the central city suffers high rates of unemployment and poverty, overcrowded schools, and inadequate school buildings, substandard housing, and the lack of such basic neighborhood facilities as a place to meet, day-care centers, neighborhood health and welfare centers. Social alienation prevails; riot is the flag of desperation.

The overcrowded city is one aspect of the population movement; the stagnating rural town is another. It is all part of the same story but it is not a simple story. Overall, our population is now experiencing a 1-percent increase in births over deaths. Thus, while our rural population—in towns of 2,500 or less and on farms—undergoes an outmigration of between 500,000 and 600,000 a year, it remains constant in total numbers; it is, therefore, declining proportionately to the growing national population. At the same time farm population is suffering a drop in absolute numbers. These figures are overall figures and tend to obscure the fact that for our minority groups rural outmigration is proportionately much greater particularly among those persons moving from the Deep South. A large proportion of these persons make their way to the central cities of our large metropolitan areas. This undesirable pattern results in a floating element of the innercity population who remain unassimilated and become all too easily the pawns of those fermenting riot.

We must devise ways of developing business and employment opportunities within our smaller cities. This summer the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber gave us a glimpse into the future.

Whether the Nation follow(s) a market-oriented policy, a policy of acreage controls and price supports, or a policy of all-out production, some 30 percent fewer man-hours of work in agriculture (will) still be needed in 1980.

In other words, in 1980 we will need only two-thirds of the farm labor we have today. The Nation should take advantage of this increase in farm productivity but not at the expense of the unneeded farmworker who must be provided with job opportunities accessible to where he lives.

The Advisory Commission recommends investment by the public in old and new communities in rural areas and "preferential formulas, similar to those applied to centers of unemployment, applicable to bidders on Government contracts by firms located in areas of serious underemployment." Such a concept meshes well with H.R. 12802, which I introduced on September 11, 1967. My bill presents, as a beginning step, a way

for the Nation to develop business and employment in smaller cities and areas of underemployment and unemployment, to assist in bringing excess farm labor and other unemployed and underemployed labor into a new productive relation to society and yet to enable such people to remain in less densely populated areas, and not to be forced to migrate to our already overcrowded cities.

Let me consider specifically the needs of the West and of my own State, New Mexico. The West is, of course, the most recently settled portion of the country and it is an area where farms are still being established. However, it has one of the lowest rates for retaining its farm-born population on the farm and, in fact, finds it necessary to depend on migrants from other areas to replenish its farm population. Nevertheless, over 95 percent of those persons who are farm-born but leave the farm remain in the West. New Mexico is not losing population. In fact, over the last century, New Mexico has grown at a faster rate than the United States as a whole. Much of our population lives in small cities and we have only one standard metropolitan area, Albuquerque. Our State is vigorous and young with proportionately more people under 20 than has the United States as a whole. The State's proportion of adults who have completed 1 or more years of college is higher than the United States average. While incomes within the State are about the same as the national average, the State has almost as many white-collar workers as blue collar.

The overall picture is good. However, we must not overlook the disparities which exist within our State. Figures on employment and education are pulled up by the high averages found in our most prosperous communities. For example, Los Alamos, which did not exist in 1940, had a population in 1960 of over 13,000 persons. The median education of this population was 12.9 as compared to 11.2 for the State as a whole. A high of 80.4 percent of the population had completed high school and the median income reached \$9,269 as compared to a State median of \$5,371. 43.5 percent of the households had incomes of over \$10,000. It is important to recognize that disparities exist as a first step toward bringing similar advantages to all of our citizens. Let us not forget that 24.4 percent of our households are still at the poverty level existing on incomes under \$3,000 per year.

To strengthen our small cities is not only in the interest of New Mexico but also of the Nation. New programs will be required but we must also reexamine and redirect established programs in the light of the urban-rural balance. The proposal which I make does not rely on complicated procedures and large funding but rather it depends upon the private sector response to Federal incentives. We are aware of the high and immediate impact of Federal procurement. As I have pointed out previously, the Federal Government contracts for more than \$85 billion a year, and where such contracts go influences job opportunities and hence population spread. Today Federal procurements go overwhelmingly to heavily urban areas. We must devise ways for

the spread of investment to small cities so that the Federal Government will be more readily able to implement its policy of slowing the heavy flow of population into our large cities.

Such an approach to Federal policy is consistent with the recent emphasis, within the Government and without, on the importance of the role the private sector must play in solving our urban-rural problems. For instance, plans have recently been announced to involve the private builder more closely in the construction and management of public housing. A search has been launched for Federal excess lands to be converted into sites for low-income housing and industries that offer jobs to the unemployed. The FHA is moving to facilitate loans to persons within the inner city and a group of insurance companies has already announced plans to implement its policy of putting aside \$1 billion for loans to housing projects and commercial enterprises within the slum areas.

Legislative proposals have been submitted to induce private industry to provide jobs and housing within the slum areas.

This is—

According to the New York Times—consistent with the thrust among urbanists to devise new ways of attracting the private sector into the low-income housing field.

My bill is quite consistent with this trend. It provides that, in awarding contracts, the Government would give credit on the bids received from cities of under 250,000 population. One percent credit will be given cities with a population under 250,000, 2 percent if the area is under 100,000 population, and 3 percent if the area is under 50,000 population. A separate credit of 2 percent is proposed for any area where unemployment or underemployment exceeds the national average or for areas of serious emigration.

Such a bill could be easily implemented. It would require only that the Secretary of Labor determine, at least quarterly, those areas in which unemployment or underemployment is in excess of the national average, and those areas of serious emigration, and that the Secretary of Labor determine, at least metropolitan areas and the population of such areas on the basis of the latest census.

Let us put Federal action behind a sane policy to attain an urban-rural balance.

CASE FOR THE DEFENSE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, the Dallas News recently published an editorial entitled "Case for the Defense" which mentioned some of the favorable results of the war on poverty. It points out that of the 30,000 antipoverty workers in the cities which were plagued by riots this

past summer, only 16 were arrested. It describes the activities of the OEO workers in other cities who worked to help prevent riots.

As gratifying as these antiriot measures are, however, we should not forget the less spectacular activities of the many other thousands of OEO workers who are working across the country to improve the lives of the poor. They seek to give hope to the poor by showing them that a way exists for them to help themselves. It is their efforts, and their successes, which are the best riot preventives.

In order to share this editorial with my colleagues, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

CASE FOR THE DEFENSE

It is generally conceded that the bad apples in the War on Poverty barrel did much to spoil the entire program's image this summer. The Office of Economic Opportunity ran a survey on the situation, and, in all fairness, that side of the story deserves to be heard.

For involvement in the riots, 16 poverty-war workers were arrested; 29,984 were not. Of the 16 suspects, only 6 were employed full-time in the program. None has been convicted.

Walter H. Richter, former state senator and now Southwest regional director for the OEO, recently ticked off what the War on Poverty was doing hereabouts while the riots were going on elsewhere.

In Dallas, in April, quick action by anti-poverty workers was credited with helping to keep a potential police-brutality explosion from occurring.

In Oklahoma City, five boys with police records were put to work with the recreation and police departments. The one with the worst record did the best job, organizing a highly successful trash cleanup campaign in the slums.

In San Antonio, off-day police played big brother to Negro and Mexican-American youths, taking them to ball games, picnics, swimming pools and the like.

In Corpus Christi, reports the head of the police juvenile bureau, "criminal activity is almost at a standstill in those neighborhoods where the antipoverty program is operating."

Those are some of the bright spots, but they do not erase the smudges. Allan Maley, who directs Dallas' arm of the poverty war, sought to put it in perspective: "If you really believe that a local community should have the right to run its own programs, then how do you keep the community from having the right to fail as well as to succeed?"

ORDER OF THE ITALIAN SONS & DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA URGE RECOGNITION OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues a very forthright and constructive statement made by the Order of the Italian Sons & Daughters of America on October 5 before the House Judiciary Subcommittee which held hearings on legislation to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday.

This great organization, in the best American tradition, is calling upon the

Congress of the United States to give long overdue recognition to Christopher Columbus—the eminent navigator who discovered America 475 years ago.

The statement of the Order of the Italian Sons & Daughters of America follows:

STATEMENT OF THE ORDER ITALIAN SONS & DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA RELATING TO COLUMBUS DAY

It is the position of the Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America that Columbus Day should be declared a national holiday. Recognizing that it is an official holiday in at least thirty-six states, this alone should be persuasive reasoning why the United States Congress should enact a law making it nationwide in observance.

The Americans of Italian origin in this nation are disturbed that efforts to make this a national holiday are generally characterized as an attempt to impose a holiday in the United States for the satisfaction of only Americans of Italian origin. It is the position of ISDA that if it is the intention of the sponsors of this legislation to make Columbus Day as a holiday simply for Americans of Italian origin, then we will be opposed to it. The sole justification for making this a national holiday is to pay tribute to the discovery of America. October 12 is the birthdate of the Western Hemisphere. It is a date which commemorates the opening of the Western Hemisphere to the countries of Europe. Moreover, the Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America does not wish to participate in any argument as to who arrived first. Whether the Norsemen were here first, whether Lief Ericson did in fact come here, whether the Irish were here first, all of this is immaterial to the essential point. It was the coming of Columbus to America and his landing here on October 12, 1492, which opened the new world to the old world.

It is rather melancholy to compare the commemorative celebrations of Columbus Day in the United States with the enthusiastic commemoration in Central and South America. Our Latin American neighbors make this indeed a truly national festival. At the present time in America, because we have no national holiday, we see that usually the commemorations are sponsored by organizations of Americans of Italian lineage or religious groups such as the Knights of Columbus.

Although our organization is one of the largest organizations of Americans of Italian lineage, it is nevertheless our opinion that the necessity for making Columbus Day a national holiday is based not on an attempt to honor any one ethnic group, but to pay tribute to the date which heralds the discovery of the new world.

Another reason remains for advocating the creation of this new national holiday. Generally speaking, it has been the trend both in labor contracts and in modern thinking that each month of the year should feature some type of national holiday. Thus we see New Year's day in January; Washington's Birthday in February; various religious holidays in March, and April, including Purim, Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and the first day of Passover; in May we have Memorial Day; in June, Flag Day; in July, Independence Day; (there is no particular holiday in August because this is generally a vacation month); Labor Day in September; Thanksgiving Day in November; and Christmas in December. The creation of a national holiday practically midway between the Labor Day holiday of September and the Thanksgiving Day holiday in the last week of November would come at a most appropriate time.

For these and other reasons the National Council of the Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America has adopted the following resolution:

Resolved: That the Order Italian Sons and

Daughters of America urge the Congress of the United States to enact October 12 as a national holiday entitled Columbus Day for the purpose of commemorating the discovery of America.

Judge RUGGERO J. ALDISERT,
National President.
JOHN B. DIGIORNO,
National Secretary.

BRITISH LABOUR PARTY ACTION IN SCARBOROUGH

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I and my colleague, JOHN DOW, had the pleasure of attending a number of sessions of the annual conference of the British Labour Party, at Scarborough, England, at the invitation of members of the party's executive committee. The occasion was a memorable one for me because of the warmth of our welcome, the generous hospitality offered to us, and the obvious spirit of friendship expressed for the American people, even by those most vehement in their opposition to the policies of our Government in Vietnam.

We were invited to this conference to discuss Vietnam—the changing attitudes of the American people, and the American Congress, and the hopes for averting a greater war and obtaining a stable peace. We learned much of British attitudes on this subject, and at a later date I will take the time to expound on this point.

Today I want to make only one point clear. Over the strong objections of their own leaders—who value the benefits of the "special relationships" between their country and ours, and fear the impact on that relationship of any change in their policy of supporting our course in Vietnam—the Labour Party voted for dissociation from that policy. Lest there be any question as to the strength of their policy statement, I quote it in full:

This Conference calls upon the Labour Government to dissociate itself completely from the policy of the United States Government in Vietnam and urges it to support U Thant and the overwhelming majority of the United Nations in trying to persuade the Government of the U.S.A. to end the bombing of North Vietnam immediately, permanently and unconditionally.

Conference believes that any settlement must be based upon the 1954 Geneva Agreement, which required the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Vietnamese soil, and the reunification of Vietnam under the government chosen by the Vietnamese people.

The margin of victory for this resolution was not large—2,752,000 votes for, to 2,633,000 votes against. Obviously this was due to the very understandable desire of many of the delegates to stand behind their leaders, even though they may have disagreed with them. I am sure my colleagues need no explanation of how this might be true.

I need to make one additional point lest some of my colleagues might wish to

attribute this action by the Labour Party to the influence of Congressman Dow and myself. The vote on this resolution was taken prior to our arrival in Scarborough. Knowing the sensitivity of any political organization to efforts by outsiders to influence their decision, it is probably just as well that this was so.

COPTER PILOT BEGGS BACK FROM WAR DUTY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Friday, October 6, 1967, edition of the Gadsden Times about a returning Vietnam hero. As the Times pointed out, return of a hero is always notable, but in this case doubly so, for it marked another chapter in the 2-year saga of WO Franklin D. Beggs.

This young man took some rather unusual action to get the opportunity of serving his country. His story is unique and one that I feel needs the close attention of everyone. In this era of frustration and indecision on the part of many of our young people, it is certainly heartening to know we have dedicated young men such as Warrant Officer Beggs.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the Record at this point and commend it to the close attention of my colleagues:

COPTER PILOT BEGGS BACK FROM WAR DUTY (By Bill Maxwell)

An Army helicopter pilot, wearing the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with 16 Oak Leaf Clusters, the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart, returned to Gadsden yesterday after a year's duty in Vietnam.

Return of a hero is always notable, but yesterday's was doubly so, for it marked another chapter in the two-year saga of Warrant Officer Franklin D. Beggs. For Beggs and his wife, Linda, were divorced two years ago so the husband could meet Army requirements and fulfill a burning desire to do his part in the war. They remarried, of course, after his wings were assured.

Neither Linda nor her husband believed in divorce—and still don't. But two years ago, Franklin (Linda calls him "Buddy") had too many dependents with his wife and son Mark to enlist in the Army and do his bit in Vietnam. Divorce was the only answer, both agreed, and it was done.

Franklin felt he had to go to Vietnam, and he did. After a year of flying the "choppers", five months in troop carriers, etc., and seven months as pilot of a gunship, he is a veteran of around 850 missions. He's done his bit—and more.

And on hand to greet him at the airport was Mark and his second son, Danny, 16 months old, who was born after the saga began. Beggs' parents, Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Beggs, from Decatur, also were on hand as was Linda's mother, Mrs. Elgin M. Bowen, of Gadsden.

Neither Beggs nor his wife regret the sacrifices they have made for that year in Vietnam, serving his country as he felt he ought to do.

"There's a little bit of everything over

there," Beggs said. "I'm glad I went for I found out a lot of things about myself. Glad to be home? Sure I am."

And Linda shows the same fortitude she displayed two years ago when Franklin first broached the idea of a divorce to gain his dream of serving in Vietnam. "It's been an awfully lonely year," she said, "but I'd do the same thing over again if that (divorce and marriage) were the only way."

There has been one break in the year's separation. Linda met her husband in Hawaii last July when he was given an R&R leave from combat duty. They spent a memorable week together, Beggs returning to combat duty and Linda coming back home to wait out the remainder of the year.

From all the worldwide publicity his divorce-enlistment-remarriage caper received, one would think that Beggs would come in for considerable ribbing from his buddies in the service, but not so, he says.

"Sure, they knew all about it since Stars and Stripes carried the story," Beggs explained, "but there wasn't any ribbing. They seemed to respect me for it."

Beggs sustained a shrapnel wound on a combat mission July 27, ground fire coming through the ship to "nick" him (his description). At the time he was flying 20 feet above the treetops on an assault mission, and was the only member of the four-man crew wounded. They were attacking Red bunkers at the time.

Beggs flew his last mission on Sept. 24 in support of a combat assault, but drew no return fire from Charlie (enemy forces).

Beggs left Vietnam last Monday by Air Force jet to San Francisco and then on to Dover, Del. From there he took a bus to New York City Tuesday to meet his wife, who was there with her sisters, Barbara, 18, and Mrs. Carolyn Mabrey, both of Gadsden. The three have been touring as a religious singing group with Evangelist David Epley of St. Louis.

The Beggs appeared on the CBS television show, "To Tell The Truth," yesterday morning. The taped show will be aired Oct. 16.

And what's on their schedule next? "Rest and plenty of it," they agreed. After three weeks' leave, Beggs reports to Ft. Stewart, Ga.

Mr. Beggs' story began in September, 1965, when he said a desire to fly and a compulsion to serve his country became intense. He tried to join the Army but was turned away because he was married, had a child and had no previous military service.

"The only thing I could do to get in was divorce Mary, join up, and then remarry," Mr. Beggs said.

"My wife had enough faith in me to respect my desires and wishes. She feels the same way I do and I know things will be a lot better for us now that I've gone, than if I had turned my back on it," Mr. Beggs said.

YOUTHS ON THE GO

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to read and hear good things about teenagers. And it is especially satisfying to follow the works of the nearly 3 million boys and girls who are members of 4-H Clubs.

Last week, the Sand Mountain Reporter, a biweekly newspaper in my district, published a timely editorial rec-

ognizing the splendid work done by these young men and women. As the editorial points out, the spread of 4-H to 75 foreign countries is proof that the "learn-by-doing" program for youth is sound and successful.

Under unanimous consent I include in the Record this excellent editorial:

YOUTHS ON THE GO

It's a treat this week to read and hear so many good things about hometown teenagers who are members of a real go-go group—4-H. During National 4-H Week, we join the nation in saluting nearly 3 million of the finest boys and girls anywhere in the world.

Four-H's are always on the go—both at home and abroad. The spread of 4-H to 75 foreign countries is further proof that the "learn-by-doing" program for youth is sound and successful.

Parents of 4-H members are on the go, too. They volunteer as club or project leaders; serve as judges of projects such as livestock, clothing, safety, health and scores of others. They chaperone members to meetings, fairs, camp and social events. They "finance" projects that require a cash outlay to get started. They encourage sons and daughters to keep trying until desired results are achieved. They see to it that 4-H is recognized in the community and throughout the country as a valuable experience for the development of Head, Heart, Hands and Health, and the making of responsible citizens.

If you are not yet acquainted with 4-H, we hope you'll make an effort to learn more about this unique youth organization. Then urge your children 9 to 10 to join. The Cooperative Extension Service of Auburn University supervises 4-H through its state and county staff.

Four-H has something for every boy and girl, no matter where they live.

The slogan for the 1967 4-H Week, is "A World Of Opportunity—Join 4-H." And this we heartily endorse!

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this has been a year in which much has been said about civil disobedience. Last week, a noted constituent of mine, Lewis F. Powell, a past president of the American Bar Association and member of the President's Crime Commission, delivered the following address on the subject of civil disobedience to the Southern Co., conference of directors and executives at Point Clear, Ala. At this point, I would like to insert Mr. Powell's address in the Record for the interest of my colleagues:

This will be a lawyer's talk about law and order and civil disobedience. The subject is related to complex social and economic problems—some of the most perplexing of any age. But there is no hope of solving these problems unless an ordered society is preserved.

There is deep concern today about the disquieting trend—so evident in our country—toward organized lawlessness and even rebellion. One of the contributing causes is the doctrine of civil disobedience. This heresy was dramatically associated with the

civil rights movement by the famous letter of Martin Luther King from a Birmingham jail.

As rationalized by King, some laws are "just" and others "unjust"; each person may determine for himself which laws are "unjust"; and each is free—indeed even morally bound—to violate the "unjust" laws.

Coming at a time when discriminatory state and local laws still existed in the South, civil disobedience was quickly enthroned as a worthy doctrine. It met the need of intellectuals and theologians for a moral and philosophical justification of conduct which, by all previous standards, was often lawless and indefensible.

Initially, disobedience tactics were directed specifically against discriminatory laws. The sit-ins and demonstrations were aimed primarily at segregated facilities and denial of voting rights—largely in the South. But as the use of disobedience tactics expanded, the relationship between the act of protest and the law protested became increasingly attenuated.

Indeed, as the protest movement expanded to northern and western cities, its objectives broadened from specific discriminatory laws and practices of the South to the age-old social and economic problems of bias, poverty and unemployment. Predictably, disobedience tactics were soon employed in other causes—on the campus and across our country.

Few voices spoke out against civil disobedience. Because of its association with the cause of civil rights, criticism of disobedience and its tactics was largely muted. Many persons of goodwill—including many clergymen and campus intellectuals—were so enchanted by the "causes" that they gave little thought to the means employed or to where the disobedience road would lead.

But all who advocated civil disobedience were not so naive. Political activists and extremists of all kinds were quick to recognize the potential of this doctrine as an extralegal means of attaining goals—and even of promoting revolution. Moreover, a doctrine which tolerates and justifies disobedience of law—implemented by sit-ins and street mobs—is made to order for cynical leaders promoting rebellion and other extremist causes.

One of the few national leaders, who had both the insight and the courage to speak out against civil disobedience tactics, was Mr. Justice Hugo Black. Writing early in 1966, he said:

"Governments like ours were formed to substitute the rule of law for the rule of force. Illustrations may be given where crowds have gathered together peaceably by reason of extraordinarily good discipline reinforced by vigilant officers. Demonstrations have taken place without any manifestations of force at the time. But I say once more that the crowd moved by noble ideals today can become the mob ruled by hate and passion and greed and violence tomorrow. If we ever doubted that, we know it now. The peaceful songs of love can become as stirring and provocative as the Marseilles did in the days when a noble revolution gave way to rule by successive mobs until chaos set in. . . . It . . . [is] more necessary than ever that we stop and look more closely at where we are going."

It is notable that Mr. Justice Black wrote these prophetic words in February, 1966, before the emergence of black power as an overt doctrine, and prior to the riots of 1966 and 1967.

But few heeded his warning. Despite clearly visible danger signals, political, religious and intellectual leaders continued to tolerate and justify civil disobedience—even after such major eruptions as Watts, Cleveland and Chicago.

There seemed to be a curious unawareness that once lawlessness is tolerated and justified it feeds upon itself and leads either

to revolution or violent repressive measures. It has been said wisely:

"Once you give a nervous, hostile and ill-informed people a theoretical justification for using violence in certain cases, it is like a tiny hole in the dike; the rationales rush through in a torrent, and violence becomes the normal, acceptable solution for a problem. . . . A cardinal fact about violence is that once initiated it tends to get out of hand. Its limits are not predictable."

So much for a review—obviously incomplete—of the origin and escalation of contemporary civil disobedience. This brings us to the year 1967—a year of crisis in which the symptoms of incipient revolution are all too evident.

Two movements have been merging: (1) a militant Negro nationalist movement, summed up in the slogan "black power"; and (2) a radical political movement called the "New Left" or "New Politics," which hopes to change our form of government. The two movements have been converging, and now pursue the common causes of black power and frustration of America's attempt to contain communism in Vietnam. Both of these movements rely heavily upon civil disobedience tactics.

The public is widely aware of the Negro revolt. There is far less awareness of the New Left, its organizations and its radical groups. There are a number of New Left groups with varying degrees of militancy. Although not yet coalesced into a single organization, they are moving toward a united front—certainly on race and Vietnam issues.

Most Americans—of both races—have been shocked and dismayed by a summer of unprecedented discord. The great majority of Negro citizens have been as dismayed as the whites. Yet, the average citizen, preoccupied with his own problems and pleasures, assumes that domestic tranquility is an inalienable right. There is a child-like disbelief that this land of the free—internally secure for 100 years—is actually confronted with strife and violence on a massive scale.

Complacent Americans would be well advised to heed the warnings of the militant leaders. Here are some random examples of what they are saying and planning—quite openly:

Carmichael—Carmichael has allied himself and black power with revolutionary Communism. Speaking at Havana he said: "There are no longer any isolated struggles. They are all correlated . . . The only solution is armed struggle."

H. Rap Brown—Speaking, of all places, in a Washington Episcopal church with permission of the controlling clergy, Brown is quoted as saying:

"We'll make the Viet Cong look like Sunday school teachers—violence is necessary."

"Get you some guns—(and) burn this town down."

Martin Luther King—The prophet of civil disobedience. King seems bewildered at times by the escalation of his own doctrine. On occasion he has joined moderate Negro leaders in criticizing riots. But he is arm-in-arm with Carmichael and McKissick in slandering his own government and in inciting violence of draft laws. He has said:

"America is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today."

And he has compared the use of new American weapons in Vietnam to the Nazi testing of "new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe."

King's favorite role is organizing disruptive demonstrations. He is now urging "massive civil disobedience" for the purpose of "dislocating" northern cities. He is planning such "nonviolent" tactics as weekly school boycotts, blocking plant gates with unemployed Negroes, and disrupting governmental operations with sit-in demonstrations in federal buildings.

Core leaders—Although CORE has recently

received a grant from the Ford Foundation, its leaders are now committed to black power extremism.

McKissick, replying to a question by a white reporter as to what the Negro wanted, put it quite simply in the classic terms of revolution:

"The answer is—everything you got right now, and everything you hope to get."

A New York Times story reported that CORE's number two leader, Wilfred Ussery, believes that:

"Armed conflict between black and white can no longer be averted."

Father Groppi—A newcomer to dubious prominence is Father Groppi, a Milwaukee Catholic priest. Working with the NAACP Youth Council, he has organized and led paralyzing demonstrations for open housing. The liberal mayor of Milwaukee, Henry W. Maier, charges that Groppi is "trying to incite riots," and that "rational discussions with him are impossible." Father Groppi has recently been quoted as saying: "Morally, I have no argument against the black man's right to use violence."

Dr. Benjamin Spock—Spock, a New Leftist dilettante, also has joined those who condone rebellion. Speaking at the recent convention on New Politics, he said:

"The situation in America is desperate. The principal sign of it is the revolt of our black fellow citizens. . . . The founding fathers declared that people who are oppressed, and can find no other redress, must rebel."

Staughton Lynd—Lynd, a Yale faculty member on leave and an intellectual leader of the New Left, made an unauthorized trip to Hanoi. He insists that representative democracy is outmoded; that we must substitute a "participatory democracy"—which apparently would function through mass meetings and demonstrations. In a revealing article to the New York Times magazine section, Lynd argues that the uprisings in the cities have been "rebellious" and not riots; and—citing the American Revolution and other irrelevant precedents—he justifies the Carmichaels and the Browns and their call for revolution.

The foregoing are only a few—if among the better known—of the leaders of militant civil disobedience. Their roles and views differ, and I do not suggest that each is equally responsible for the lawlessness which threatens to engulf our country. Yet these, and hundreds of lesser known leaders, are men determined to remake America—not by the democratic processes of our institutions but by varying forms and degrees of coercion. The more radical of these leaders, like Carmichael and Brown, are openly advocating revolution.

Let us turn now from the leaders to examples of extremism in action.

The first is Vietnam Week of last April, when tens of thousands marched in New York and San Francisco. Draft cards were burned, placards of hate displayed, and vicious anti-American speeches made by King, Carmichael and Spock.

The initial planning for Vietnam Week took place at a Chicago conference, instigated and dominated by Communists and fellow travelers. The Communist line objectives of Vietnam Week were to undermine United States opposition to communism in Vietnam and to ferment racial discord.

Shortly following these marches, King announced the formation of "Vietnam Summer"—a coalition of opponents to American policy and includes well-known Communist allies and other luminaries of the "hate America" left. The avowed objective is "to organize opposition to the war in ghetto areas," and encourage our youth to "refuse to fight."

As Dean O'Meara of Notre Dame Law School has said, many of those who thus aid

the Communist enemy "give themselves away":

"For never once do they condemn the terrorist tactics of the North Vietnamese; never once do they condemn Hanoi's rejection of all peace proposals . . . ; never once do they lament the suffering and death borne by our forces in Vietnam. These persons weep only for the enemy."

Having attained some success and notoriety through Vietnam Week, the New Leftists then planned and held what was called "The National Conference for New Politics", attended by some 5,000 delegates. Its stated purpose was to create a united front among groups supporting the black power and "peace" movements. King and Spock were among the principal speakers. The Communist party, as in the case of Vietnam Week, was active in the planning and manipulation.

The conference, dominated by black power militants, condemned "the savage and beast-like character that runs rampant through America as exemplified by the George Lincoln Rockwells and the Lyndon B. Johnsons". It also adopted a straight Communist Party line resolution, which pledged:

"Total and unquestioning support to all national peoples liberation wars . . . particularly in Vietnam."

The flavor of the New Politics Conference was summed up by Walter Goodman, writing in the N.Y. Times Magazine, who said:

" . . . it stunk of totalitarianism."

Vietnam week and the Conference on New Politics are chilling examples of growing extremism in this country. The dominant themes of both were hatred of fellow Americans and contempt for our institutions. Their goals are to be attained not by democratic processes but by various techniques of civil disobedience.

One of the major targets is American policy in Vietnam, now under virulent attack. Reasonable men may well differ as to the wisdom of this policy. But only those who are blinded by their prejudices, or who are indifferent to the consequences of lawlessness, will deliberately incite disobedience of valid laws. A most recent example of this irresponsibility is the public demand by a group of some 320 clergymen, educators and writers that churches and synagogues be used as "sanctuaries" for youths who defy the draft law. If thousands of young men refused to fight for their country, as pointed out by Tom Wicker of the New York Times:

" . . . the power (of the government) to pursue the Vietnam war or any other policy would be crippled if not destroyed. The government would then be faced, not with dissent, but with civil disobedience on a scale amounting to revolt."

Or, suppose, the campaign against payment of income taxes gains widespread support. This is not an illogical possibility, as this relatively bland form of civil disobedience has appeal to a broad spectrum of disaffected citizens. But however appealing it may be, wide spread refusal to pay taxes could bring orderly government to a halt.

So much for examples of nonviolent—though potentially disastrous—disobedience. But the greater concern has been the violent eruptions in our cities—where civil disobedience has reached its ultimate form. I do not know whether any of the persons or groups named above was legally implicated in any of these riots. Let us assume no such implication. Yet few can doubt that the cumulative effect of the black nationalist movement, and of the incitements to hatred and disobedience were major contributing factors. As J. Edgar Hoover has said:

"Those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets."

There have been riots or major disorders

in some 75 cities in 1967. Detroit was the shocker, with 43 killed, 386 injured and part of a great city destroyed. A less likely city for a race riot would be hard to find. Detroit had "no housing ghetto"; its Negro population was largely prosperous, and its race relations considered excellent.

The recent NBC documentary—in which Daniel P. Moynihan participated—contains a frightening analysis of the riot and the future prospects. Although apparently spontaneous in its inception, militant organized groups took over promptly, supplied the weapons, the Molotov cocktails, and directed the sniping and the arson. This was no revolt of oppressed people against local conditions. It was armed rebellion against American society.

Although the underlying causes are complex and deepseated, America's acceptance of civil disobedience was both a cause and a justification. Mr. Moynihan, former assistant secretary of labor, put it this way:

"We have legitimized opposition to the police and disobedience to law. Now in the North it has become massive opposition to the rules of white society."

The Negro militant viewpoint, gaining increasing support, is that America is "irredeemably racist"; that Negroes should "forget America," and that the only course for Negroes is to bring about a final, violent apocalyptic confrontation of black and white."

The NBC investigating team confirmed that extremists already are planning future violence. Next time, it is said, they will attack and destroy the white sections of Detroit and other cities. As Frank McGee described it:

"These black extremists are willing and eager to risk a bloody showdown with white society."

Sharing the same pessimism, Roscoe Drummond recently said:

"The black militants and their white associates are irreversibly committed to the destruction of American democratic society to achieve their racist goals."

One may hope that the views of these observers—competent as they are—exaggerate the danger. But none can doubt that America faces a crisis of lawlessness with the gravest potential for disaster.

No man knows all the answers, but to me—as a lawyer—some simple truths are self-evident:

An ordered society governed by the rule of law must be preserved. Without law and order none of the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution can be safeguarded—for whites or blacks, radicals or conservatives. History has demonstrated that once a society condones defiance of law and due process, the liberties of all are lost in the excesses of anarchy which follow.

With these truths in mind, and if our cherished institutions are to be preserved, Americans of good will—of both races—must act together to assure the following:

1. Toleration of civil disobedience and justification of lawlessness must end—in government, in the pulpits, among the media, and on the ivory towered campuses.

2. Those who incite riots and rebellion should be treated as the most dangerous of criminals and relentlessly prosecuted. The irresolution of our society is attested by the fact that we hasten to put petty criminals in prison and yet permit the Carmichaels and Browns to remain free. Indeed, some still dignify their criminality by inviting them to speak in our schools and churches.

3. Those who participate in riots and rebellion should also be prosecuted with vigor, particularly the arsonists and the snipers.

4. Criminal laws, at all levels of government, should be reviewed and strengthened to deal specifically with the foregoing crimes in light of present conditions. Penalties should be adequate to deter criminal conduct and justice should be swift and certain.

5. Effective gun control laws should be adopted at state and federal levels; sniping at policemen and firemen should be made special offenses with severe penalties; and possession or use of Molotov cocktails should be serious crimes.

6. Those who incite and participate in nonviolent civil disobedience should also be subjected to criminal sanctions. Where needed, laws should be clarified and strengthened with appropriate penalties provided. This is a more difficult area, as First Amendment freedoms must be carefully safeguarded. But rights of free speech and peaceful assembly do not justify incitement to revolt or the willful violation of draft laws, income tax laws or court decrees.

7. Laws, especially against those who engage in nonviolent civil disobedience, should be enforced uniformly and promptly. A few draft law violators have been prosecuted but most have been ignored—especially the radical leaders who incite draft evasion. Public authorities have also failed to prosecute the growing number of dissidents who willfully refuse to pay all of their income taxes. How can officials sworn to uphold the law ignore its willful violation? In justice, how can a Cassius Clay be sent to jail for draft evasion while prominent self-styled intellectuals who refuse to pay their taxes are allowed to remain free?

8. In summary, America needs to awaken to its peril; it needs to understand that our society and system can be destroyed. Indeed, this can and will happen here unless Americans develop a new impatience with those who incite and perpetrate civil disobedience; unless laws against violence and disorder are strengthened, and enforced with vigor and impartiality; and unless we return once more to the orderly and democratic processes which alone can preserve our freedoms.

Now, a final caveat. I have spoken as a lawyer, deeply conscious that the rule of law in America is under unprecedented attack. There are, of course, other grave problems and other areas calling for determined and even generous action. The gap between the prosperous middle classes and the genuinely underprivileged—both white and black—must be narrowed. Many mistakes have been made in the past, and there is enough blame for all to share. But we have passed the point where recriminations and bitterness will solve problems.

We must come to grips realistically with the gravest domestic problem of this century. America has the resources, and our people have the compassion and the desire, to provide equal justice, adequate education and job opportunities for all. This, we surely must do.

At the same time, we must avoid the mindless folly of appeasing and even rewarding the extremists who incite or participate in civil disobedience. There must be a clearer understanding that those who preach, practice and condone lawlessness are the enemies of social reform and of freedom itself. In short, the one indispensable prerequisite to all progress is an ordered society governed by the rule of law.

THE U.S. DOLLAR—ITS PROBLEMS AND ITS CHALLENGES

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, one of the country's most distinguished bankers, Henry T. Bodman, the chairman of the

board of the National Bank of Detroit, made the following speech before the Citizens Research Council. It is a pleasure for me to share his thoughts with you:

THE U.S. DOLLAR—ITS PROBLEMS AND ITS CHALLENGES

(By Henry T. Bodman, chairman of the board, National Bank of Detroit)

I have been asked to make some comments this afternoon about the monetary problems of the United States. Obviously that is a very broad assignment—and I can get into only one or two aspects of this most far-reaching subject.

Most everyone in this room will remember the revered C. F. Kettering, who had as one of his greatest assets the ability to "debunk" things that look complicated, but aren't. I remember one evening some 15 years ago hearing him make a speech here in Detroit in which he touched on the subject of economics—and particularly money. He held up a dollar bill and said, "This is a receipt for doing some work," and went on to say, "If you start printing up these pieces of paper without doing any work, the value of these receipts will diminish; and if you print up enough of them, they will become completely worthless."

While the monetary process isn't quite that simple, "Ket" certainly got over the basic idea.

This is exactly what happened in post-World War I Germany, and post-World War II Hungary, just to cite two examples.

Many countries are experiencing similar conditions today. Bill Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in Washington, recently told me of a conversation he had with one of his counterparts in a central bank in South America. Bill said his friend told him that if in any year the price level in his country goes up 40% they fight inflation; if it goes up 20% they fight deflation!

In Brazil—which incidentally is not the country just mentioned—the country's currency depreciated in value at a compound annual rate of 31% between 1956 and 1966. This means that the price level rose at the rate of 45% *per annum* over the past decade—a fairly full-blown inflation, one might say.

Incidentally, this is one reason interest rates are so high in Brazil and in other countries with depreciating currencies. Short-term interest rates for example in Brazil range from 24% to 36%. People with money to lend are not only trying to earn a reasonable rate of return—they are also trying to protect themselves against the certainty that the loans they make will be repaid in money with less purchasing power.

Here in the United States our price experience, as measured by the value of our money, has been considerably better than that of most other countries in the past decade. Our record over the past 18 months, however, has not been so good.

Consumer prices, after having increased at a 1½% annual rate during the 1959-64 period, have been rising at a 3¼% rate since late 1965. Wholesale prices, and most importantly, industrial wholesale prices have risen at a 2% annual rate since late 1965, after having remained essentially stable in the 1959-64 period.

This acceleration of price increases in the United States has been due largely to the excessively stimulative fiscal and monetary policies of the Government and the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis recently cited evidence that indicates that fiscal policy during the first half of 1967 was more stimulative than at any time since World War II. This was during a period in which our labor force was being fully utilized with unemployment running at or below 4%.

The "money supply"—defined as private demand and time deposits in commercial banks, plus currency in circulation—grew at a 7% annual rate from 1960 to 1964, and at an 8% annual rate from 1964 to 1966. So far, in 1967, the money supply has grown at an annual rate of 13% at a time when the biggest Treasury deficit since World War II is in prospect.

Now, what I am saying is that the price rise acceleration of the past two years is an indication that we have been following inflationary policies. And the continuation of those policies will result in even more harmful price trends in the months ahead, to the detriment of all.

We have run budget deficits in 29 of the last 35 years, and the one facing us in fiscal 1968 promises to be enormous even if Congress passes the President's tax proposals. In the absence of such passage or of meaningful reductions in expenditures, the deficit could approach the startling figure of \$30 billion. Such a situation could well result in frightening some of our foreign creditors into cashing in their U.S. dollar claims for gold we can ill afford to lose.

The immense Federal budget, and the heavy tax load required to carry it, are real barriers to greater economic achievement. True economic growth depends on the performance of the private economy. It does not depend on the performance of the Government, except for Government to resist the temptation to interfere with the working of the marketplace. Such interventions tend to frustrate the legitimate objectives of both management and labor, and to diminish the desires of the less fortunate to get ahead by contributing more to their own, and thus automatically, to the total welfare.

Returning now to our monetary and fiscal problems, the inflationary character of the Federal debt derives from the fact that it is much more likely than private debt to become imbedded in our monetary system. Congress has powers, delegated to the Federal Reserve, to create money; and the Federal Reserve acts under this responsibility to see that the U.S. Treasury can raise the money it needs to pay its bills. Notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Reserve is, and should continue to be, an independent body, there is little doubt about what course of action the Federal Reserve would take should it find itself in the unhappy position of having to choose between accepting inflation on the one hand or standing by while the Government falls in an effort to finance itself.

Our experience with regard to inflation in the U.S., of course, has been substantially better than that of most other countries around the World—in large part due to the tremendous productivity of the American economy, and to the relative freedom we have had in the past to exercise American ingenuity without obstructive Government intervention. Our leadership in productivity stems from the enormous capital formation that takes place in this country, made possible to a great degree by the ability and willingness of individuals and businesses to save a portion of current income. For both the Government and our citizens, promoting economic progress requires increasing amounts of capital formation. The problem is how?

The solution is to save more so that more money will be available for investment in new and more efficient plant and equipment. For capital originates largely from one source—the savings of individuals and of businesses. One way to save more, apart from consuming less, is to earn more by producing more.

To produce more, we need more and better tools; they equip a growing labor force and they help create more and better goods and services in greater variety and at a lower relative cost. By thus increasing output, tools

enable the consumer not only to consume more but also to save, lend and invest more—and in the process to contribute to the further regeneration of the nation's stock of capital goods and to even further rises in output.

The key element in this process, as suggested earlier, is saving. But saving requires incentives, and few things are more damaging to those incentives than inflation—the erosion of the real value of the money saved.

It is often asserted that a high rate of capital formation constitutes a threat to employment opportunities. It seems to me that this view is grossly fallacious. It rests on an implicit assumption of a generally static economy in which there is little or no growth.

As a matter of fact, in the private economy of the United States the rate of increase in the labor cost of an hour's work has been significantly greater than the rate of increase in the cost of a unit of capital equipment from which the improvements in output and efficiency mainly come. In other words, relative to wages, tools have become cheaper as, thanks to our scientists and engineers, they have become more sophisticated.

Yet tools have not replaced labor; rather they have re-aligned and expanded employment opportunities. As our increasing stock of tools has helped generate further economic growth, new jobs have replaced old jobs and earlier fears of automation have been replaced by recent evidence of "overfull" employment—even shortages of skilled labor to man the new machines. Thus, experience shows that high rates of capital formation go hand in hand with high rates of employment.

Furthermore, since capital formation is obviously dependent upon favorable levels of corporate earnings, the welfare of the employee is vitally dependent on the profit performance of his employer. Thus, the true objectives of labor and capital are in a very real sense the same, although sometimes it doesn't look that way.

Many will argue that a little inflation is all right, and even necessary to promote economic growth. This sentiment is patently false. Professor Karl Brandt of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, and formerly a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, has pointed out just what inflation does. To quote him: "Inflation consumes the most precious substance on which any economic system depends: the confidence of the people that the rules of the game are fair and equitable and that long-term obligations are faithfully fulfilled. Inflation makes a fraud of such transactions and gives easy gains to some people at the expense of innocent others." It is a tragic thing that inflation injures most those least able to bear its cost.

Or, as Henry Hazlitt recently said, "The truth is that inflation is neither necessary for full employment nor sufficient to secure it. What is necessary is a workable coordination of the price system. This entails a co-ordination of wages and prices. Individual wage rates must be at the levels at which the full labor force can be profitably employed. Prices must be high enough to keep a profit incentive, but low enough to permit the optimum volume of goods and services to be sold."

Wage levels which put severe pressure on profit margins will always result in higher prices, and sooner or later, higher unemployment. The Federal Government interprets these results as calling for new spending programs to employ the now unemployed, and for vast injections of new credit and money to clear the market of the new higher priced goods. Then the whole dreary process starts over again.

It is a race that can only end in gross distortions of income distribution, incentives, and production, in falling confidence in the dollar, and in even more severe balance of

payments problems. Such a disastrous inflationary race can be prevented if the Congress has the wisdom and the courage to promote an environment in which the continuous imposition of excessive wage demands can be halted.

This doesn't mean a freeze on wages, prices, or profits; nor does it mean anti-strike legislation; nor does it mean a return to "Guidelines"—voluntary or otherwise. But it does mean the revision of our present Federal laws which permit special compulsions to be put on employers and which grant special immunities to labor unions. Repeated injections of money and credit are no substitute for balanced labor laws in promoting lasting full employment. Excessive wage demands tend to be disruptive and are not in the long-term interests of employees. Such demands will create inflationary pressures that cannot be contained by monetary or fiscal measures without eventually creating serious economic dislocations, including widespread unemployment, or interest rates so high as to stifle new capital formation.

Numerous schemes proposed to promote sustainable long-term growth in the economy do not and will not accomplish this objective. In this category I would place most attempts to raise, by legislation, minimum wages above market levels.

Like most man-made laws intended to amend or repeal natural economic principles, such proposals create conditions quite opposite to their promised effects—instead of raising the earnings of those in low income categories, their earnings are reduced or cut off altogether.

As a consequence of uneconomically high wage rates in many job categories, we have priced tens of thousands of potential workers, including teen-agers, out of job opportunities. The economic cost alone is high enough; the social cost, as we have recently learned, is enormous. Furthermore, a decreed rise in the minimum wage level narrows wage differentials and thus generates additional pressures in many industries for uneconomic wage increases across the board.

Another equally unsound policy is to decree artificially high farm prices while at the same time restricting farm output. This is irresponsible and uneconomic because it boosts the cost of living and promotes a misallocation of the nation's resources. It is also inhuman at a time when one-third of the world's population suffers from malnutrition.

Returning again to our monetary and fiscal problems, an important consideration apparently overlooked by many proponents of deficit spending is the impact of Federal internal deficits on our international balance of payments situation. Since 1957 we have spent, invested, and given away about \$25 billion more outside the United States than we have received. This "balance of payments" deficit has been met by a loss of nearly \$10 billion of gold and by a \$15 billion increase in foreign short-term claims on our remaining gold reserve. Today such foreign short-term claims on U.S. gold amount to more than \$25 billion, which is about twice the size of our entire gold stock, most of which is already required under present law as backing for our Federal Reserve Currency.

Despite the moves which have been made by the Administration in the past few years to protect the dollar, our balance of payments position has continued to deteriorate during the first half of this year. It is abundantly clear that more fundamental measures will have to be taken if the dollar's international position is to be assured over a long period of time.

One of the outstanding scholars in the field of international finance, Professor Gottfried Haberler of Harvard University, has given a candid view of our precarious situation. Dr. Haberler, who served from 1943-47 as an economic specialist with the Federal Reserve Board, was Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Bureau of Eco-

nomics Research in 1957-58 and is now one of its Directors. He is also a member of the Advisory Board of the American Enterprise Institute, of which Board our own Paul McCracken is distinguished Chairman.

In a monumental study entitled "Inflation—Its Causes and Cures" that Dr. Haberler prepared for publication by the Institute, he has this to say: "The position of the United States as the world's foremost banker, and of the dollar as the world's principal reserve currency, greatly increases our responsibility. At the same time, this excludes easy solutions which would be open to others. Thus, if a small country is confronted with a large deficit in its international transactions, it could let its currency drop a few points and that would take care of the problem."

"The U.S. cannot tamper with the gold value of the dollar without committing a crass breach of the confidence of all those who have entrusted us with keeping their international reserves and without provoking an international financial crisis which would greatly weaken American leadership in the Free World."

This is a statement not to be dismissed lightly.

On the same subject, Dr. Wilhelm Vocke, first President of the German Federal Bank following World War II, has said, "It is the gold convertibility alone which permits the dollar to perform its function as a world currency. Without it, the dollar would go under with disastrous consequences for America's political prestige throughout the world. By overestimating her power as well as her indifference to the strident warnings sounded by her enormous gold losses, America has overstepped the boundaries which exist even for the strongest nations."

As touched upon earlier our external problem is further aggravated by our huge internal Federal deficit. When we have to raise incomes taxes because of the extent of the Federal deficit, raise them above already very high existing levels, we hurt our balance of payments position even further. Why? Because as most economists now agree, income taxes, both personal and corporate, are reflected in the prices of finished products. So, by raising our income taxes internally, we become less competitive abroad.

Much the preferred way to correct this situation is to reduce overall spending by the Federal Government. It seems most probable that defense spending will go up in the years ahead, even if Viet Nam expenditures should decrease. Already there is talk of a major increase in expenditures for strategic weapons lest Russia overtake us in that area. Some officials also believe that the U.S. will have to deploy an extremely costly Anti-Ballistic Missile System.

If the Administration will not cut less essential spending in the face of such demands, the question is raised: How much more taxation can be imposed without significantly interfering with the ability and willingness of people to save, to invest, and to produce? After all, it has been this process that has built in the U.S. the greatest industrial complex in the world, but even it cannot flourish under conditions of continuing inflation or excessive taxation.

This is the time for Congress to demonstrate enough courage to insist on substantial reductions in non-essential spending—and only then decide whether the proposed tax increase is the best alternative.

Let us pray that we can regain enough economic sense, discipline, and integrity to deal with the substance of our problems, and to refrain from the apparently easy solutions that bring in their wake further inflation, deteriorating confidence in our currency, and ultimately the reappearance of those problems in magnified form.

As a distinguished European banker once told me, "If you want the dollar treated with

respect abroad, you will have to treat it with respect at home." To which I might add the observation that when we lose our world financial leadership, we also lose our strength as a world power; and the representative form of government we have known may well suffer a defeat from which recovery will be difficult if not impossible.

This is what is at stake. It is groups such as this that must see to it that the real issues are clearly presented. We must have people in Government sufficiently intelligent to understand these problems, and with enough courage and dedication to do what is necessary to save this nation from the catastrophe that is bound to occur unless we take positive action before it is too late.

HOWARD J. SAMUELS—AN EXCELLENT CHOICE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's nomination of Howard J. Samuels to be Under Secretary of Commerce reflects in a most favorable light upon the President for the wisdom of his choice, upon Mr. Samuels for the sterling characteristics which have brought him to this position, upon New York State for its longstanding tradition of providing exceptional people for high public office, and upon the Nation and the society which have produced this outstanding individual. To my pride as a New Yorker, I add a great sense of personal satisfaction, for I have known Howard Samuels for many years. In examining the life of this man, one is immediately struck by an apparent discrepancy—how could any individual have accomplished so much at the age of 47? Let me briefly sketch the background of Howard Samuels to illustrate my point. After attending public schools in Rochester, N.Y.—where, incidentally, he was a champion tennis player—he attended Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Most people would be satisfied with just receiving an education from MIT. Howard Samuels, however, graduated from MIT with an idea, contained in his thesis, for what is now a \$50 million a year corporation, employing more than 2,000 people. In fact, the company is the largest producer of plastic packaging in the Nation. On the staff of Gen. George S. Patton during the Second World War, Mr. Samuels became a lieutenant colonel at the age of 25. To indicate the wide range of his interests and his commitment to the public good, I will mention some of his public service affiliations: chairman, Citizens Committee for an Effective Constitution; trustee, Public Education Association; member, Employment Service Task Force; participant, White House Conference on Education; member, National Citizens Committee for Community Relations; member, National Committee for Employment of Youth; chairman, American Histradut Cultural Exchange Institute; New York chairman, March of Dimes and Cancer Crusade;

member, Governor Harriman's Business Advisory Committee; member, American Israel Public Affairs Committee; member, national policy committee on pockets of poverty of the Farmers Educational Foundation. He has also served on many city, county, and State civic groups. Last year, he was honored with two awards for his service to humanitarian causes. Mr. Samuels comes into Government in a period of great challenge and dynamic change. His life and his career indicate that he is just the right man for these times.

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, business and industry joined the ranks of the war on poverty last week, strengthening the administration forces which have been fighting a successful but limited war over the past few years.

In his announcement of a pilot program "to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed," the President stressed the need for the involvement of the private sector in reaching those citizens bypassed by conventional training programs.

To achieve needed cooperation, the new program has been designed to eliminate two major difficulties—the need to deal with a wide variety of Federal agencies and the inherent risks in providing job retraining for the hard-core unemployed.

The administration has shown foresight in recognizing these deterrents to the cooperation of the private sector. It will provide one-stop service to interested companies in an office headed by William E. Zisch, vice chairman of Aerojet-General Corp., Los Angeles, a firm that has had experience in operating in the Watts section of Los Angeles. The government will assume the special costs of training the severely disadvantaged as well as the additional risks of operating in ghetto areas.

The pilot program will operate in five of the cities already served by the Labor Department's concentrated employment program—Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Antonio, and Washington, D.C. Although this program is relatively new, it has already proven that even the most severely disadvantaged of our citizens can be trained and placed in adequately paid jobs when business accepts its share of the problem. In Los Angeles this program is committed to some \$7.6 million already and is having excellent results through the cooperation of private industry.

Writing in the current issue of the Harvard Business Review, the mayor of St. Louis, a city with its own hard-core unemployed problem, points out that 75

percent of the hard core can be made employable. And he added:

But the Federal Government's programs taken all together leave the iceberg bulk of the unemployed untrained and unplaced. This is private industry's job.

With private industry and the Government working together at the task, most of the hard-core unemployed—currently unemployable—should soon become taxpaying citizens.

This program heralds a new era for the disadvantaged and for the private sector that will soon receive them.

FOOD AID NEEDED

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no criticism for the loyal opposition, but I believe Richard Wilson's column in today's Washington Star is excellent advice for all. Because we are a rich nation, we should not take individual credit for our prosperity. We must remember the good fortune which has been left us and, in return for our good fortune, we should be thankful enough to care for the poor, the sick, and the needy. Certainly we can afford it.

I insert Richard Wilson's fine column in the RECORD at this time:

HOUSE REPUBLICANS STUMBLE ON FOOD-AID ISSUE

(By Richard Willson)

Republicans in the House after reversing themselves on a federal rat-control measure, slipped on the blinders again quite naturally and unaffectedly where hunger and malnutrition in the United States are concerned.

The House Agriculture Committee has set aside by a vote of 23 to 7 a bill supported by both Mississippi Democratic senators to study starvation and provide up to \$75 million for food and medical attention for the undernourished.

This measure resulted from disclosures that in Mississippi and elsewhere in numerous other states millions of children and adults were, for various reasons, not benefited by food distribution and health programs initiated 35 years ago to carry out the common will that no one in such a rich country as this should go to bed hungry.

It must be said for the Mississippi Democratic Senators, John Stennis and James O. Eastland, that after at first bristling over disclosures that thousands of children are slowly starving in their state, they recognized the condition and moved to do something about it.

Some Republicans have not been as quick to learn. Their experience with the rat control bill taught nothing. After laughing rat control out of the House, 42 moderate and urban Republicans found themselves so badly bitten that they reversed themselves and enabled the House to approve a \$40 million two-year plan for rat control in city slums.

A similar measure has been passed in the Senate and a difference must now be resolved on what agency will handle the rat-control program.

Moderate Republicans are now trying to rescue the Stennis legislation for food and

medical aid for the forgotten and hungry children who have fallen through the slats of badly administered state and federal food-aid programs.

Speaking of reluctant members of his own party and Southern Democrats, Rep. Albert Quile, R-Minn., said, "They may be able to get by not taking care of rats, but when you have starving Americans, that's one thing we cannot tolerate." Quile and other Republicans are trying to revive the program as an emergency aid measure in the poverty bill.

This controversy reveals again the fatal fault in the conventional Republican approach to human problems, which has not been corrected in 20 years of trying by the moderates and plays a large, and perhaps the controlling part, in freezing the GOP into its minority political position.

The fault grows out of the defensive attitude that this is a great and strong country and that those who find it wanting in some respects wish to cause trouble, upset the apple cart and perhaps even change the whole American system. They are thus to be resisted as dangerous radicals or careless tinkers who would aimlessly or willfully foul up the whole works.

What the conventional Republicans have failed to recognize fully and emphasize sufficiently is that a modern technocratic society benefits the vast majority but leaves pockets and fringes of human misery, maladjustment and deprivation which add up to an impressive total. Translated into human terms these pockets and fringes in their totality become an embarrassment of large proportions in a rich country, and to do nothing about them or accept them as the unavoidable fall-out of progress, gives those who do so a heartless countenance which is a heavy political debit.

The problem is no better illustrated than in the matter of unemployment. Unemployment for heads of families who wish work is actually now at the practical minimum in an economic set-up where movement from one job to another provides a fluid labor supply.

But, in addition, there are more than 2 million who cannot find work because they are not qualified or are not physically adapted or trained, including some hundreds of thousands who do not wish to work or do not have such rudimentary requirements as how to speak or write English intelligibly, or who have prison records unacceptable to employers.

Not to do anything about this merely sweeps under the rug a serious human problem, not to say that what is swept under the rug may be the seeds of a whirlwind.

To get back to the hungry and starving, these people are in the pockets and fringes of human misery of the abundant society. If the Republicans wish to improve their dour countenance they could well follow the lead of Quile.

COLUMBUS DAY, OCTOBER 12

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this week, on Thursday, October 12, 1967, we mark the 475th anniversary of that truly great event in the annals of American history—the discovery of the New World by the great Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus. It is a day known to every man, woman, and child in America, and the name of Columbus is as well

known as the names of Washington or Lincoln.

While Columbus Day is not a national holiday, its importance has been long recognized by many of our States. In many of our towns and cities there are parades, speeches, and other festivities to celebrate this date. The schools have special programs to acquaint our youngsters with the remarkable feat accomplished by this young Genoan. For Columbus was only 24 years of age when he set out to prove his theory, that land lay beyond the uncharted, untraveled, and unexplored waters west of Europe.

Since the discovery of this continent by Columbus, those of Italian descent have contributed to the development and enrichment of our great country. Our history and the American heritage is full of their contributions; they are an integral part of our culture. They came as explorers and settlers, to help conquer the wilderness; they joined in our initial fight for freedom, liberty, and justice.

Through the years, down to today, Italian immigrants and their children have made their mark in every possible occupation, in the most artistic and highest paid, as well as in the hardest and the humblest. Today, there are over 25 million Americans of Italian descent in the United States, and this group constitutes one of the most wholesome segments of American life; a people who are peaceful, God-fearing, law-abiding, and useful citizens making a valued contribution to the greatness of America in every field of endeavor.

To our people, Columbus represents not only the starting point of our Nation, but he is truly the symbol of a great and persevering heroic spirit who dared to penetrate great and unknown dangers in his search for "a better way." It is this mighty spirit that is responsible for our remarkable national growth and development into the greatest and best land on earth. And it is of the Columbian spirit and heart that we must be ever mindful if this country and our people are to successfully meet the great challenges and responsibilities that face and rest upon us in this dangerous period of our history.

HUMANE LABORATORY ANIMAL TREATMENT ACT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study

and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities, and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals.

As you know, legislation was enacted by the 89th Congress to regulate dealers, prohibit the kidnapping of animals and safeguard animals in transport. While this was an important step, thousands of animals used in laboratories and research facilities are not covered by this law. Under Public Law 89-544, if an animal is in the experimental process at a research facility, present law does not apply. I believe the law should be extended to give these animals the benefit of all possible humane treatment so long as medical research is not hampered. I believe this bill accomplishes that purpose.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be required to establish standards and regulations. Regular inspections would be made to enforce the regulations and standards once promulgated. For a research facility to be accredited it would be required to maintain the required standards and pass the inspections subject to judicial review.

I urge the House to enact this legislation and thereby declare that good health and high quality are essential in the laboratory animals used in medical research activities vital to the health and safety of the people of the United States and that laboratory animals used in medical research should be spared unnecessary pain and discomfort.

LAND IN PHOENIX IS PROVING FERTILE FOR ELECTRONICS

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, that the Phoenix, Ariz., area has become a center to be counted in the electronics field is proven by the following article, "Land in Phoenix Is Proving Fertile for Electronics," which appeared in the New York Times of October 8, 1967. We are proud to have this industry in the Valley of the Sun, and to have provided the companies which have located there with the fine workers, educational facilities, and recreational resources which they need and enjoy. Our latchstring is always open, and we look forward to welcoming others in this field—or in any other field—who might wish to take advantage of all the State of Arizona has to offer. The article follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—"This town is full of engineers and scientists. They're a funny breed. They work hard and then they want to relax hunting or fishing or boating or picking up rocks. That's why they're all eager to come here to live."

The speaker is the public relations manager for one of the major electronics companies that have settled here and are directing their major expansion projects in

this region. Most of the big names in the industry are represented here in manufacturing or research operations. They include the General Electric Company, Motorola, Inc., the Sperry Rand Corporation, the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, Kaiser Aerospace and the Aircsearch Manufacturing Company along with such native-grown companies as the Dickson Electronics Corporation, Ameco, Inc., EMP Electronics, the Rogers Corporation and Unidy-namics.

Ask the top executives of any of these companies and they all agree on why they chose Phoenix for their newest operations. They state flatly that engineering and scientific personnel seem to be attracted to the region and that cooperation with the local university, Arizona State, is so perfect that they are intrigued by the possibilities of updating their education.

They also cite the "living in the sun year-round" attitude that prevails here; the proximity of mountains, lakes and even the desert for recreation and the casual approach to life. Then, too, there has been up to now a readily available supply of semiskilled or even highly skilled labor, plus plenty of non-skilled help ready for training.

The experience of Robert B. Roe, vice president and general manager of Sperry's flight systems division, in locating in this region is typical. Back in 1954 and 1955, the company decided to end its corporate concentration in the New York area. Since the division was then making an automatic pilot for the B-52 and automatic controls for the QF-80 drone, it was decided to look first east of the Mississippi River for a new site in line with Department of Defense desires for spreading around defense business.

"We decided to look the West all over," Mr. Roe recalled in a recent interview. "We liked it here especially because of the ideal flight conditions with sunny, cloudless skies and plenty of room for maneuvering. The education facilities at Arizona State also attracted us and we would be much closer to Boeing, Lockheed and Douglas, our three major customers."

"We were also more than impressed with the figures supplied by Motorola and Aircsearch on low turnover and ability to recruit workers. Our experience since we moved here in 1956 has more than verified their bullish outlook on this region," Mr. Roe added.

SOME 3,100 NOW EMPLOYED

Sperry's initial facility in Phoenix comprised about 85,000 square feet of space and 500 workers, with about 90 per cent of the products turned out for the military. Today, the division employs some 3,100 persons in 360,000 square feet of space on the north side. About 70 per cent of today's output is for commercial aircraft, with most of the balance for the military. The company is taking a serious look into the field of executive aircraft and Mr. Roe feels certain that "in the next five years we'll probably have to increase both our facilities and our labor force by 30 to 50 per cent."

The Western Electric Company, supply and manufacturing arm of the giant Bell System, is right now going through the same experience that Sperry did back in the mid-fifties. It is building on the west side of the city what will be the world's largest cable manufacturing facility, with an annual capacity of 53 billion conductor feet a year. T. G. Clark, general manager of the plant, said that when it was in full operation next year it would consume about 1.3 million pounds of copper a week and raise Western Electric's cable manufacturing capacity by 25 per cent.

The giant facility's manufacturing area is about 1,200 feet long, 600 feet deep and 40 feet high and is completely air-conditioned with a system that is one and a half times larger than that used in the Houston Astro-dome. Situated on an 80-acre tract, it will

be the largest power user in the state and will employ some 1,200 persons. There will be about 20 acres under roof, or 850,000 square feet.

MACHINISTS TRAINED

Mr. Clark said Western Electric would bring in only key personnel and recruit the others from the vicinity. About a year ago the company opened a school to train highly skilled machinists, a group that is in short supply even in this electronics mecca.

"We've been quite pleased with the training program to date," Mr. Clark said. "About 50 percent of the trainees are from minority groups and we have had no problems at all. They want to learn and they're progressing on schedule. We're quite pleased with their enthusiasm."

The decision to locate here was based in part on the reasons advanced by others, coupled with the fact that more than 50 percent of the nation's copper is mined in the state.

"We'll be loading our five other cable plants by computer from here," Mr. Clark said. "This means that as supplier to the Bell System, we'll use our IBM-360 computer installation to decide the economics of which plant should turn out the cable for use in the various areas of the country." The other plants are in Buffalo, Baltimore, Kearny, N.J., Chicago and Omaha.

A NEIGHBOR'S COMPUTER

Western Electric turned to a Phoenix neighbor, General Electric, for a GE-PAC 4020 process computer as part of an electronic system that will monitor production. It will be used initially for production testing and later expanded to handle more complex control problems.

Vern S. Cooper, manager of G.E.'s information services marketing operation here, is certain that Phoenix is destined to become an even more important electronics center in the future. He noted that transportation of some finished goods posed some problems, particularly for heavy items.

"We'll never see the day when transportation will be as bad as it is today and today it's really excellent," he explained, adding, "We know we can always get back here if we can get off the ground at the other end."

G.E. produces its computer lines here, sells them through trained sales people in the field and intends to keep its main production operations in this region. The over-all computer operation is coordinated in New York City, while European production is centered in France and Italy.

As for G.E.'s well-known problems in the computer business, Mr. Cooper attributes most of them to "one hell of a lot of bad press."

"The problems are really generic. Third generation computers have provided problems for everyone in this industry, I.B.M. included," he said.

A MODEST START

G.E. officially entered the Phoenix area in November, 1956, with the formation of its computer department, which then consisted of a handful of employees in rented quarters. It had one project—development of a computer complex, known as ERMA, for the Bank of America. At that time, it was the largest single order ever received. Ground was broken for a permanent facility on a 160-acre tract northwest of the city. There have since been three major additions that have more than tripled the total floor space and the work force now totals some 6,000 people in one million square feet of space.

But the real Phoenix success story in the world of electronics comes from Motorola, which in December, 1948, opened the first electronics facility in the region. It was housed in a 6,500-square-foot laboratory near the downtown area. Today, with some 17,000 employees in three separate divisions operating in about 3.2 million square feet of

space, Motorola is the state's largest industrial employer.

SPENT YEAR THERE

Dr. Daniel E. Noble, vice chairman of the company and its chief technical officer, chose Phoenix because he had spent a year as a child in this region and believed that it would attract the technical people he needed. He convinced Paul V. Galvin, the founder and president, that if Motorola was to stay among the leaders in electronics, it would have to get into the solid-state art as soon after the war as possible. The military electronics division was formed in the company's first new building in the city. This was followed in 1956 by the semiconductor products division, which is now reportedly the world's largest single production facility of its type.

The third division—control systems—was founded in 1962 and now occupies the original semiconductor plant.

Dr. C. Lester Hogan, vice president and general manager of the semiconductor division, looks upon his division as part of "a great industry, a perfect example of just how capitalism should work." He explained that there are roughly 100 companies in the industry and "no monopolies either on the manufacturing or the consumer end."

"We have to succeed in the face of real competition, matching wits with each competitor," he went on. "Today, I can say we are the second largest semiconductor manufacturer in the world, with 15 per cent of the total output. We're damn close to the largest and expect to be that next year with 16 per cent of the total."

He placed Texas Instruments, Inc., on top of the industry, with the Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corporation third. Dr. Hogan does not see any shakedown in the industry to the point where there will be only a handful of manufacturers.

"The art changes too rapidly for that," he explained. "We now have a microminiature silicon chip that contains 524 individual components and a complexity comparable to that of three or four color TV sets. [It is about the size of a pinhead.] See me next year and we'll probably have one with 1,000 components and then 100,000. Who knows?"

NO FEAR OF PEACE

Dr. Hogan is not one who "fears any outbreak of peace," noting that it would at worst only create minor dislocations.

"The pace of research in integrated circuits is bound to continue," he said. "Our first customer is the computer industry and our second is the automotive, where the potential is almost without bounds."

Ralph Elsner, general manager of Motorola's aerospace center in the government electronics division, also believes there would be little effect on his division once peace comes.

"If the war ended tomorrow there'd be very little change in our forecasts for 1968 operations," Mr. Elsner said. "The Department of Defense arsenal would have to be replenished and we make such items as fuses and small missile guidance devices, all of which would be in short supply. Then, too, we'd be working on new items that are still in our research and development stages. We would also look for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide a shot in the arm to its procurement."

He pointed out that it was company policy to maintain steady employment through not devoting more than 50 per cent of the work effort to one branch of the military and not more than 20 per cent to any single program.

Raymond A. Zack is general manager of the control systems division, the newest division and one that many observers expect to be the fastest growth area for the company.

It produces digital processing and supervisory controls in competition with such

leaders in the field as Foxboro, Honeywell and Taylor Instruments. Mr. Zach reported his division had "an excellent year to date principally in the industrial process line because of growing acceptance of electronics in this area." He noted that progress has been especially strong in the petrochemical industries where Motorola specialized equipment is compatible with computers from the major manufacturers.

One major project with great growth potential is in the discrete data processing field in conjunction with a major telephone system. In the event a line is down or a phone out of order, the operator marks a card, inserts it into a reader which transmits the information by telephone to a computer that selects the closest repair spot and dispatches the repair crew in hours instead of days in remote locations.

Virtually all of Mr. Zach's business is not militarily oriented, so he, too, has no fears of labor problems in the event of peace. In fact, he expects to add between 10 and 15 per cent to his work force and "should more than double the number of people we employ within three years because of new products and an expansion program aimed at doubling the division every three years."

The competition for skilled labor continues within the region. The Dickson Electronics Corporation is a perfect example. Donald C. Dickson, the founder and president, worked for Motorola until seven years ago when, with \$300,000 capital, he founded his company to manufacture products similar to those produced by Motorola's semiconductor division. Dickson had 71 employees then; today it has more than 1,100 and its sales last year topped \$11.5-million. Two weeks ago, it opened a new \$1.9-million facility.

IMPORT QUOTAS AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial of the August 16 Wall Street Journal deserves close attention. The Journal notes that—

At the moment . . . the textile and other industries are pushing for still more quotas to restrict the inflow of goods from abroad.

The Journal goes on to list some of the disadvantages of the quota method of controlling imports. First, it notes that, in general principle, quotas are a far less desirable means of controlling imports than tariffs. A tariff applies to all importers and, therefore, does not discriminate among supplying countries and individual importers, and it at least provides public revenue. The Journal points out that—

Under a quota, on the other hand, allegedly all-knowing bureaucrats carve up the domestic market to fit their idea of the equitable, "proper" pattern.

Quotas create upward pressures on prices and they tend to give the importers favored with the quotas an assured share of the business and thus an unhealthy stake in maintaining the quota. The Journal concludes that—

The worst tactic of all is to try to manipulate the market with import quotas, all the

while pretending that this enforces American ideas of equity and fairness.

It is worth emphasizing the difference between tariffs and quotas. Tariffs are a means of measuring differentials in competitive conditions among nations, in comparison to the quota device. In the words of a Washington Post editorial on October 7—

When compared with the insidious quotas, tariffs are an enlightened form of protection. Consumers, to be sure, pay higher prices when tariffs are levied. But if the demand is sufficiently strong, goods may be imported over the tariff wall. Moreover, the burden of protection borne by the public will be somewhat reduced by the tariff revenues that flow into the Treasury.

Under quotas, the protection tends to be absolute since the volume of imports is limited by fiat.

In this context it is apt to point to the fact that the quota device seems to be becoming much more widely accepted. Many groups have succeeded in having quota bills introduced on their behalf in the Senate and the House. Responding to or to minimize these pressures, the Senate Finance Committee has scheduled 3 days of hearings on quota measures for steel, oil, meat, dairy products, and textiles, among others, beginning on October 18. The hearings will serve the useful purpose of allowing the relevant interests to have a hearing, but on the other hand, it signals the need to make clear that quotas, by definition, are a movement away from fairer international toward a trading world where the economic forces that lie behind movements of goods and services across national boundaries are harnessed by arbitrary governmental administrative controls that prevent the operation of the marketplace and inject political judgments into economic processes.

The Wall Street Journal editorial referred to above follows:

THE CASE AGAINST QUOTAS

In testimony before Congress the other day, President David Rockefeller of Chase Manhattan Bank was arguing for removal of nontariff barriers to trade, such as import quotas. The point is well-taken and timely, and not only for the reasons he mentioned.

After the tariff cuts negotiated this year at Geneva, quotas and similar devices, Mr. Rockefeller says, "remain the most serious obstacles to trade expansion." At the moment, moreover, the textile and other industries are pushing for still more quotas to restrict the inflow of goods from abroad.

New quotas here would, of course, invite new quotas overseas, and the U.S. stands to lose more than anyone from moves to curb the growth of trade. This nation's exports, after all, long have substantially exceeded its imports; even if imports rose by a larger percentage than exports, the U.S. trade balance still could improve.

As Mr. Rockefeller contends, therefore, trade restraints of any type are a bad bargain for the American economy. We would add that, of the two major types, quotas are much less desirable than tariffs.

To begin with, a tariff at least permits a semblance of a free market to continue to operate. Foreign producers, by working to increase their own efficiency, may be able to cut prices enough to find entry into the tariff-protected market. Domestic producers thus still have some incentive to keep their own costs and prices down.

Under a quota system, on the other hand, allegedly all-knowing bureaucrats carve up

the domestic market to fit their idea of the equitable, "proper" pattern. Even if the planners' decision is relatively fair to begin with, economic change soon is sure to distort it into something quite different.

By curbing import competition, quotas naturally tend to push domestic prices higher than they otherwise would be; like tariffs, they thus represent a hidden subsidy to domestic producers, a subsidy paid by consumers through the higher prices.

In addition, though, quotas also are a subsidy to importers, since they often can buy goods at a lower world price and sell them in the shielded domestic market. It's small wonder that quotas usually are harder to erase than tariffs; the importers as well as domestic manufacturers have an economic stake in their preservation.

Still another reason why quotas are a greater evil than tariffs is that import duties at least provide the Government with a certain amount of revenue. Quotas are, if anything, even more difficult to administer than tariffs, and yet they bring the Government no compensating income.

In spite of these drawbacks and others, quotas will continue to have powerful friends. In a speech the other day, for instance, Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island argued that quotas were a "simple" solution to all the problems of the U.S. textile industry.

"The solution," he said, "is to provide quantitative limitations or quotas on imports of all textiles—whether of cotton, wool or man-made fibers. . . . Controls must be global in scope—and industry-wide in application. These limitations must be broken down by different categories of textiles and textile products." What the Senator might consider a complex "solution" boggles the mind.

As we've said before, if Congress decides that any industry is so vital to the U.S. economy that it must be subsidized, the subsidies should be paid directly and openly. To siphon the funds from consumers in hidden ways is, to put it mildly, scarcely consistent with the principles of a supposedly free society.

And the worst tactic of all is to try to manipulate the market with import quotas, all the while pretending that this enforces American ideas of equity and fairness.

TAX EQUALITY: H.R. 13341, A BILL TO REMOVE THE TAX EXEMPTION OF FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is important for good Federal tax policy that we constantly cull our Federal income tax laws to be certain that we tax our citizens, however organized to engage in economic activity, as equally as possible. Over a period of years I have introduced varied legislation, some of it now law, designed to equalize our Federal tax structure in this respect. I list a few examples merely to emphasize the point.

The Mills-Curtis law, Public Law 429, 84th Congress, to equalize the Federal taxation of mutual and stock life insurance companies.

H.R. 2900 of the 87th Congress, which became part of the Revenue Act of 1962, to equalize the taxation of the institu-

tions financing homebuilding; namely, the savings and loan institutions vis-a-vis the banking institutions.

H.R. 3150 of the 86th Congress, which became part of the Revenue Act of 1962, to equalize the taxation of the cooperative form of doing business vis-a-vis the corporate form.

In need of constant review is the proper line of demarcation between those activities properly related and those unrelated to the purpose of nonprofit organizations, which is almost a separate field in itself. Certainly the question of what in-house operations government engages in directly to satisfy its requirements for goods and services in behalf of the people, instead of procuring these goods and services from tax-paying enterprises in the marketplace, should be of constant concern to those who establish Federal tax policies.

I have now introduced a bill, H.R. 13341, to repeal the tax exemptions of the Federal land banks. When the Federal land bank system was created in 1916 it was granted exemption from all taxation. At that time the composition of the Nation's agricultural economy and the character of the financial institutions which served it were vastly different from what they are today and probably justified the tax exemption. In the 50 years since their establishment these conditions have changed and, to the best of our ability to determine, the appropriateness of the tax exemption has never been reconsidered.

This is neglectful. We should review these federally chartered organizations and the laws under which they operate. Here follows a brief review for the consideration of the House.

Federal funds were retired from the Federal land bank system in 1947. Since that time the land banks have operated as private enterprise organizations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration. As private lenders, the land banks have been free to compete with other private lenders for the agricultural loan business. They have done so most effectively. In 1940 the percentage of the total-dollar volume of the farm mortgages held by the land banks was only 8.3 percent. By 1965 the land banks' share of this business had climbed to 24 percent.

Stated another way, this means that nearly one-fourth of all farm mortgage lending, which produced net earnings for the Federal land banks of \$37 million in 1966, was done on a tax-free basis. It is interesting to note that the Production Credit Association—PCA—and the banks for cooperatives, also supervised by the Farm Credit Administration, are not tax exempt. The banks for cooperatives pay taxes and the PCA's are subject to tax automatically as Federal funds are retired. Federal funds have been retired from nearly all PCA's today and so the operations are almost completely taxed.

Mr. Speaker, the point which should concern us the most, however, is that as the land banks seek an ever increasing share of the market it becomes less and less attractive to other agriculture lenders, with whom the land banks directly compete. If current trends continue the day will inevitably come when tax-pay-

ing private lenders do so little business in the agricultural field that they may no longer find it profitable to serve this market. We will have diminished healthy competition, which will adversely affect the borrower and at the same time we will have narrowed the Federal tax base, thus reducing Federal revenue.

It is to preserve and equalize the competition among lenders who serve our farmers, and thereby both to preserve for them maximum access to capital markets, and to broaden the Federal tax base, that I have introduced this tax equalization bill, H.R. 13341.

EXPORT OPPORTUNITY FOR AMERICAN AUTOS IN EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. Curtis. Mr. Speaker, a major effort of any trade negotiation is to provide greater access to foreign markets for American products. This was certainly the case with the Kennedy round of trade negotiations, which was widely considered to be successful in opening new markets by reducing barriers to trade.

A rumor has come to my attention that for an important U.S. product the Common Market succeeded in maintaining its rather high tariff barrier. The rumor, which has become somewhat widespread, was that the EEC's duties on autos would be cut by 50 percent, but that the cut would not benefit American automobiles because a French lobby representing truck manufacturers managed to get this cut limited to vehicles with engines under 2.8 litres, which would automatically exclude the normal American automobile.

Wishing to examine this matter, I requested the facts from the special representative for trade negotiations. Our correspondence appears below. According to the special trade representative, all American passenger autos will benefit from the reduction of the EEC duty on automobiles from a rate of 22 to 11 percent, a full 50-percent cut.

I should go further here to note that the 50-percent duty cut on autos is not a priori an indication that sales of American autos to the EEC will increase. On the contrary, the several EEC member countries have for years applied a special tax to cars based on engine size. This auto "road tax," discriminatory in intent, had in practice a discriminatory effect on U.S. cars, as the only cars with engines large enough to be affected by the tax.

The road tax became an important item of negotiation between the EEC and the United States, and it found its way into the chemical sector negotiations particularly. In the final months of the negotiations, as a compromise on the difficult issue of the American selling price

system of customs valuation began to form, the road tax was offered by the Community as an element in a possible ASP package. In the final negotiations, in the so-called second package of the chemical sector negotiations, the EEC contracted to modify the road tax so as to eliminate its discriminatory effects on American cars. The road tax, as an important nontariff trade barrier was considered by us a part payment for possible modification of the American selling price system, which is considered a nontariff barrier by the EEC and others.

But to date this contractual obligation, made part of the final EEC negotiations signed by the negotiating countries, has not to my knowledge been spelled out. It would be helpful to have a more exact idea of the precise means the EEC will use to implement its obligation, and to have therefore also an idea how sales of U.S. cars in Europe might favorably be affected. This matter will, of course, receive thorough scrutiny in Ways and Means Committee hearings on the implementation of the second package of the chemical sector negotiations.

The exchange of correspondence, referred to above, follows:

SEPT. 14, 1967.

HON. WILLIAM M. ROTH,
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: A report has come to my attention which I would like to verify.

I am informed that EEC duties on autos will be cut by 50% but that the cut was limited to vehicles with engines under "2.8 liters capacity." I understand that this limitation was obtained by France at the behest of its automobile lobby, and that this limitation automatically excludes the normal American automobile from the 50% cut. I would appreciate having the facts on this matter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS,
Washington, September 20, 1967.

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: Thank you for your letter of September 14 inquiring about a report that the 50 percent cut in the EEC duties on autos obtained in the Kennedy Round was limited to vehicles with engines under 2.8 liters capacity and that this limitation automatically excludes the normal American automobile from the 50 percent cut.

This report is not correct. All American passenger automobiles will benefit from the reduction of the EEC duty on automobiles from 22 to 11 percent. The misunderstanding concerning the coverage of the EEC concession on automobiles results from an incorrect understanding of the French language nomenclature covering automotive passenger vehicles in the EEC tariff.

The EEC tariff paragraph covering such vehicles has two parts. The first part, on which no concession was made by the EEC reads "Autocars et autobus a moteur a explosion d'une cylindree egale ou superieure a 2.8 litres ou a moteur a combustion interne d'une cylindree egale ou superieure a 2.5 litres." An accurate translation would be "Sightseeing and other buses with an explosion motor with displacement equal to or greater than 170.8 cubic inches or internal combustion engine equal to or greater

than 152.5 cubic inches." The second part of the tariff paragraph on which there was a 50 percent reduction merely says "other".

An improper translation of the French word "autocars" to mean "automobiles" rather than "sightseeing buses" would result in the erroneous conclusion that "the normal American automobile" was excluded from the concession on "other".

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. ROTH,
Special Representative.

REDUCING IMPORTS OF ALL TEXTILES INCLUDING WOOLEN GOODS AND WOOL

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to reduce imports of all textiles, including woolen goods and wool.

The more than 5,000 sheep growers in North Dakota depend entirely upon the domestic textile industry as the only market for their wool production. Domestic wool prices have declined as imports of wool and woolen goods have increased.

The Department of Agriculture estimates U.S. wool production for 1967 at 228 million pounds, 3 percent below the 1966 level. This is the 7th consecutive year of declining domestic wool production. Sheep numbers declined 4 percent last year.

The U.S. market for wool has shrunk from 391 million pounds in 1961 to 364 million pounds last year, a drop of 7 percent. Over the same period, imports of wool textiles have nearly doubled, from 52 million to 98 million pounds.

This flood of imports has been disastrous both for sheep growers and the domestic wool industry. My bill would help to reverse that trend. The measure would authorize and direct the President to negotiate agreements providing for orderly trade in all textile articles, including wool, cotton and products made from these fibers.

The agreements would limit imports by categories of textile articles and would be based on a representative period of at least 1 year. After a significant amount of imports was covered by agreements, the President would have the authority to set quotas for those countries which were not signatories to an agreement. If, 6 months after the bill's enactment, agreements had not been concluded, the President would be directed to establish quotas limiting imports to their average annual quantity for the period 1961-66.

This bill is a reasonable and equitable approach to a critical problem. It would permit some increase in imports as our domestic market grows and is able to absorb them. At the same time, it brings wool imports under a system of reasonable controls which will protect the incomes of U.S. wool growers.

GOVERNOR ROMNEY SPEAKS ON THE "STRATEGY FOR A NEW AMERICA"

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is now generally agreed that unresolved urban problems constitute the major domestic crisis we face today. "Lawlessness," "housing," "unemployment," "relocation," "transportation," "open space," "pollution," "renewal," "poverty," and other key words delineate the full scope of this crisis.

Gov. George Romney of Michigan recently completed a 20-day tour of actual and potential urban area trouble spots which gave rise to some very pertinent observations on the depth of this problem and what might be done about it.

Speaking before the 21st annual meeting of the National Conference of Editorial Writers last Friday evening in Nashville, Tenn., Romney pointed out the need for equal justice. He said:

The ghetto-dweller's plea for "equal justice" and the suburbanite's insistence on the maintenance of "law and order" are just differing expressions of the same objective. Almost all Americans want firm, fair enforcement of the law, which respects individual rights and insures the safety of our streets. This doesn't mean the coddling of law breakers, and it doesn't mean repressive police measures.

The Governor has made a sound observation which should be heeded if we are to achieve true and meaningful "equal justice."

Mr. Romney also spoke of the need for increased participation by private enterprise in meeting the housing and jobs crises of our urban areas. He said:

Surely, here is an opportunity for private enterprise, with union cooperation and government encouragement as needed, to create a whole new industry in the heart of the ghettos—producing improved housing at a cost the people can afford, reversing neighborhood deterioration, upgrading the skills of the work force, providing meaningful and accessible jobs at reasonable wages where there are none today, and stimulating increased economic progress throughout the central cities.

It has become increasingly clear that Government cannot do the job alone. Constructive legislation, such as the Human Investment Act and the National Home Ownership Foundation Act—which seek increased private enterprise participation—must be enacted by this Congress to provide some badly needed problem-solving apparatus.

As Governor Romney said last Friday evening:

Government's greatest role should be as stimulator, clearinghouse, and catalyst in helping to release the energies of the private, independent and voluntary sectors of the American community.

Governor Romney's address follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, OF MICHIGAN, NASHVILLE, TENN., OCTOBER 6, 1967

I have just returned from a tour across America. It was the kind of tour that few

Americans have taken, and few would care to take.

Yet I wish that every American could have been with me for those 20 days—to listen to the voices of the streets—to see the squalor of the slums—and to share the insights, the frustrations, and the hopes of concerned Americans who are striving desperately to make America's promise come true before it is too late.

For the America I saw was not America the Beautiful—not the America of the travel posters—not the America of opportunity and affluence that most of us call home.

Instead, I saw the other face of America—the America of ugly streets and rotted buildings, the America of congestion, illiteracy and want, the America of shattered expectations and rising fury.

This is the America of the inner city—jammed with refugees from rural areas, who came to an alien environment unprepared but hopeful of opportunity, only to have the dehumanizing trap of the ghetto shut around them.

This is the America where ten people live crammed into two small rooms—where a four-room flat has only one light bulb—where children sleep five in a bed—where the accumulated litter and filth of many years breeds rats, roaches and foul odors.

This is the America where men who want work cannot find it—either because they lack needed skills, or because they cannot read and write and figure well enough to take advantage of job-training programs, or because they find the doors to jobs for which they may be qualified slammed shut by racial and class discrimination.

This is the America where people are locked into dependency by a welfare system that sustains life at a bare subsistence level with a monthly handout in the mail, and penalizes initiative by withdrawing even that minimum support if the recipient makes the mistake of finding even a low-paid, unskilled, entry-level job.

This is the America where an unemployed father too often learns that the greatest material contribution he can make is to move away from home, so that his wife and children can qualify for welfare payments.

This is the America where children grow up like weeds in a jungle, untended and undisciplined, without a father's guidance and example, without the opportunity to learn the value of work, in a society whose examples of success are the pimps, the pushers, and prostitutes.

This is the America where children enter school without being able to say a single word—and where they leave school after eight, ten, or 12 years with only a third-grade education.

This is the America where a young man or woman cannot aspire to go to college—where a family cannot aspire to own a home—where a would-be small businessman cannot get capital.

This is an ugly America and an angry America.

I have walked its streets and listened to its voices. They were sometimes plaintive and dispirited, sometimes ardent, sometimes menacing.

These were not the voices of the demagogues. The Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels seem to have little active support among the people of the streets.

For the most part, these were the voices of young indigenous leaders who are increasingly emerging as authentic spokesmen of the ghetto streets—young Mexican-Americans, Italian-Americans, Puerto Rican-Americans, and Negro Americans—young men like Paris Moxley and Bernard Gifford in Rochester, Nick Dorezo in Chicago, Herbie Miller and Arnie Segura in Harlem, Roy Ballard in San Francisco, Lou Smith, Baltimore Scott and Billy Tidwell in Watts, and Hosea Williams in Atlanta.

Their message was the same. They are tired

of broken promises. Their hopes have been raised, only to be dashed. They feel that they've been tricked. They believe America has broken faith with them. They don't trust anybody, least of all political leaders. They are fed up with outsiders and experts coming in with neatly packaged projects which deny them meaningful control of their own lives.

They want to help themselves and one another, free from barriers of discrimination and unequal opportunity. They are proud of their racial or ethnic heritage. They seek escape from dependency. They are anxious to communicate. They want a piece of the action, and they want it now. They want to turn the American dream from a mocking delusion into a reality.

In Watts, I had the opportunity to meet with a cross-section of Negro leadership—from white-collar, wealthy and middle-class businessmen, to blue-jeaned, bearded militants. It was the first time since the Watts riot of two years ago that this entire range of Negro leadership had assembled in one place.

We talked for several hours. At the beginning, some were shouting, while others weighed their words with extreme caution. But before our talk was over, all were speaking with the same passionate intensity—and all were voicing the same position.

They said that in spite of all the federal, state, local and private programs Watts is as explosive as it was two years ago.

Then I asked them what they wanted. These were their unanimous priorities:

First, they want human dignity. They want white people to stop treating them as inferiors. They want to be full-fledged American citizens.

Second, they want equal justice under equal laws, equally enforced. They want as much protection and consideration in the ghetto as in the suburbs.

Third, they want equal opportunity, not mere tokenism, all up and down the line—equal educational opportunity, equal training opportunity, equal job placement opportunity, equal promotion opportunity, equal housing opportunity, equal business ownership opportunity.

When they finished with the list, one of them said, "It sounds like we want the American dream."

I checked this list in other cities, in other slums, with other leaders. They all agreed that it accurately listed the aspirations of their people.

Clearly, the conditions I saw and the problems the ghetto leaders voiced are neither local nor sectional. They are not exclusively Negro or white. They are not limited to one minority group. They are found in every part of the country where there are cities. They are national conditions and national problems.

These problems did not spring up over night. For years they have been festering, unrecognized beneath the surface, until violence flared and they could no longer be ignored.

Because one America stood by while another America suffered, we face today not only a crisis of conscience, but a crisis of survival.

The bulk of the people who live in the black ghettos of America are watching and waiting and weighing which way to go.

The Carmichaels and the Browns do not yet speak for a majority of the black community, but they can articulate and capitalize on the injustices. Their hardened attitudes are too often mirrored in the white community. America is becoming dangerously polarized.

The greatest gap between the people of the slums and the people of the suburbs—greater than the education gap, the employment gap, even the opportunity gap—is the understanding gap, the communication gap. We aren't listening to one another. We don't know each other.

The suburbs and the slums are different worlds. Economic and social distance is increased by racial distance. Too few Negroes really know any whites and too few whites really know any Negroes.

The average, comfortable American living in the suburbs or on the fringes of the central city doesn't understand the unique conditions which breed the frustration, brokenness and heartache of the ghetto. He doesn't understand the rising turmoil in the inner city. He sees it as ingratitude on the part of those who are getting a free ride at the expense of people like himself who are making their own way. He sees it as a threat to his economic and physical security. Too often, he reacts with resentment and with anger born of fear.

As a result, this nation—which needs agreement on what to do in our cities more than it needs agreement on any other single thing—is today a house divided. Far from rewarding riots, we face public pressure to do comparatively less.

We face the mounting danger of a hostile confrontation between an achieving society and a dependent society—suburb against slum, prosperous against poor, white against black, brother against brother.

And that would be the death of America.

Surely it is clear, in the wake of the 1967 riots, including Newark and Detroit, that what we have been doing to solve the problems of our inner cities has been either inadequate or wrong. Detroit was known across the country as a model of enlightened federal, state and local action. Yet Detroit suffered the worst riot, with the most deaths and greatest damage, in our nations history.

Our best and most extensive efforts in the past have been mere palliatives, not cures. They have treated symptoms, not causes. They have failed to come to grips with the structural deficiencies in American society that are the root of the problem.

We must find better answers. We must find a better way.

And I have seen across America the beginnings of a better way. I found concerned Americans undertaking innovative and promising approaches in city after city.

There is wide local variation in the solutions they are using. The answers to our problems as a nation must spring up from the rich diversity of American life. No lasting solution can be imposed from the top down. It must grow from the bottom up.

And from the bottom up, the broad outlines of a strategy for a New America are beginning to emerge.

Here are some of its components.

First, in marshalling our resources to the task, the greatest advance can be achieved without money, government, or even private organization.

This advance depends on the thoughts, attitudes, speech and daily action of each of us individually. It simply depends on our treating each other with respect—esteeming others as we esteem ourselves. This is the essence of American citizenship—the God-given right of each and all to human dignity.

Second, a strategy for a New America demands more attention to providing genuinely equal justice. And this begins with equal law enforcement.

We must insist on just laws, equally applied and firmly enforced. No American has the right to violate the law.

The ghetto-dweller's plea for "equal justice" and the suburbanite's insistence on the maintenance of "law and order" are just differing expressions of the same objective. Almost all Americans want firm, fair enforcement of the law, which respects individual rights and insures the safety of our streets.

This doesn't mean the coddling of law breakers, and it doesn't mean repressive police measures.

We need the kind of police-community relations work I saw in New York, Chicago and

St. Louis. In New York, for example, police in Puerto Rican neighborhoods are trained to understand cultural differences. St. Louis maintains neighborhood store-front stations manned by patrolmen who handle individual complaints about city services, and help people solve their problems.

We need the kind of police professionalism I saw in Chicago, where electronic communications have reduced the average time required to respond to a telephoned request for help to four minutes.

And we need citizen involvement. One of the most dramatic programs I saw was the Indianapolis Women's Anti-Crime Crusade in which 50,000 women are informally organized to ride herd on the courts, assist the police department, and work with juveniles who might otherwise be involved in street crime.

These programs, and others like them, are essential if we are to have equal justice, law and order, and a climate in which violence is rejected in favor of peaceful change.

Third, a strategy for a New America requires us to stop looking at the people of the slums as a drag on our society, and see them rather as an untapped asset. There is as much talent and leadership in the slums as there is in the suburbs. Its development will create a New America.

Too many Americans in the ghetto see themselves as hopeless failures, because they have never known success. They are losers in school and losers in jobs. We must open opportunities for them to win the first-step success that will encourage them to believe in themselves.

For example, I saw dramatic breakthroughs in basic education, developed by private groups in Illinois and Indiana, which can give a functional illiterate the reading, spelling, and arithmetic skills of a high school graduate in just a few short weeks.

I saw private street academies in Harlem which promise to guarantee a college education to any dropout who will join—not through handouts, but through patient, loving, personal effort that imparts self-discipline, strength of character, and self-confidence along with basic academic skills.

I saw job training programs that guarantee job placement to anyone who completes the training course. One Indiana program goes even further, with volunteers whose personal concern, guidance and example—on a one-to-one basis—help a new employee through the critical early weeks on a new job.

These are programs that help turn losers into winners. They not only change the attitude of the individual toward himself, but they help change the attitude of society at large.

Fourth, a strategy for a New America demands a clearer understanding and more effective application of the principle of self-help at the level of the streets.

Self-help is the creative side of black power. It is black power in a dimension too often overlooked: the power of the people themselves—yes, even poor people—to mold their own future through positive action instead of handouts or violence in the streets.

Time and again the people of the ghettos showed me how they were altering the atmosphere and direction of life around them by producing progress of their own making—progress they will fight to defend, not to destroy, because it is their own.

In Watts, I saw Operation Bootstrap, a fiercely independent self-help program organized by militants, which provides basic education, job training and job placement, along with day care services.

In Indianapolis, I saw a housing project where every home was individually owned by a family which made their down-payment by applying a thousand hours of sweat toward its construction.

In Pittsburgh, I saw a range of self-help housing that included rehabilitation of run-

down slum dwellings by both tenants and owners working in cooperation.

And again and again, I saw the self-help principle at work in the building of strong, representative ghetto organizations. The Indianapolis Crime Commission, for example, reported that strong block clubs and neighborhood associations were directly related to reduced crime rates.

In Detroit, I saw one ghetto area which escaped the riots because its people had been putting into practice the principles of effective citizenship common to small towns throughout the country. They had produced parks, clean streets, and rehabilitated homes without depending on government initiative. When the riots broke, they were not passive on-lookers—they took to the streets, defended their own neighborhood, and kept the rioters away.

In some cities, ghetto organization has achieved more equitable school and housing policies. In others, central city organizations have been given the resources and the determining voice to plan urban renewal and redevelopment of their own neighborhood.

In Rochester, New York, as a direct result of the activity of the militant ghetto organization, FIGHT, leadership from all segments of the community—from the ghettos to the giant corporations—have launched a bold, cooperative effort to guarantee job training and employment to every man and woman who needs it—including the so-called "unemployables."

The city that has a strong, representative ghetto organization is fortunate indeed. For the ardor, ambition and revolutionary zeal of the new leaders of the ghetto and those they represent cannot be quenched or even dampened—but it can find welcome expression where constructive outlets exist.

Professional agencies serving ghetto residents must learn to see themselves as advisors, not managers—as resources, not controllers. City halls must do less telling, and more listening. Government at every level must stop trying to impose ready-made plans on the people of the ghetto, and trust them with control over their own lives.

Fifth, a strategy for a New America must eliminate restrictions which hamper the full use of our resources.

Take housing. Living conditions in the ghetto are intolerable. Forty-three percent of all housing in our inner cities is seriously deteriorating. But inflation and high wage rates in the building industry have driven construction costs so high that it is uneconomical to contract for the reconstruction of run-down housing and still rent or sell it at a price ghetto people can afford.

As a result, housing conditions continue to get worse. Old dwellings are not being rehabilitated in significant numbers. New construction fell last year to its lowest point in twenty years.

Yet the ghettos are full of the underemployed and unemployed who could quickly and easily be trained in many building skills. They would be eager to learn and earn if they were given the opportunity to work on housing rehabilitation projects. And there is a potential \$50 billion market for rehabilitation housing.

No artificial restrictions should be permitted to stand in the way of meeting housing needs so urgent and employment needs so vast.

Surely, here is an opportunity for private enterprise, with union cooperation and government encouragement as needed, to create a whole new industry in the heart of the ghettos—producing improved housing at a cost the people can afford, reversing neighborhood deterioration, upgrading the skills of the work force, providing meaningful and accessible jobs at reasonable wages where there are none today, and stimulating increased economic progress throughout the central cities.

Or take the fundamental question of job

training and employment. Poverty—not race—is the common denominator of the people of the slums. And the answer to poverty is employment, not welfare—jobs, not handouts.

Business and industry must bring new plants and new jobs into slum areas. It must build new towns with new employment opportunities in outlying areas, to which ghetto residents could afford to move. It must provide sound basic education and job training so that ghetto residents can qualify to fill the jobs that are available. It must liberalize promotion policies, to open up more entry level jobs.

Both business and unions must end discrimination and establish more flexible and realistic job entry standards. They must seek to subdivide job skills to the fullest possible extent so that those with even minimum training can qualify for entry level jobs. Examples of how it can be done exist. It's time to share them and use them.

The employment of the average Negro in a job as good as that of the average white worker would add \$15 billion this year to the Gross National Product. For business in general, this increase would mean more sales, more output, more profit—and for government, more taxes and less deficit.

Business, industry and unions must realize that, in breaking through into the cycle of ignorance and poverty, their own self-interest and survival is at stake—because America's survival is at stake.

And we must eliminate restrictions on the availability of capital to start and expand ghetto enterprises.

As a rule today, the dollar bounces only once in the ghetto.

To achieve a multiplier effect, the financial community must be willing to supply working and risk capital to the ghetto entrepreneur. Experience shows that it can be just as rewarding as loans made elsewhere.

In Philadelphia, I saw thriving, modern stores owned and operated by Negroes in a dynamic, extensive program to bring risk capital—and locally controlled free enterprise—into the ghetto. A few moderately successful ghetto businessmen pooled a small amount of capital, which was supplemented with a large amount of capital from a major lending institution, making loans and technical advice available to ghetto merchants. We are already bringing this program to Michigan.

We must foster self-generating economic progress in the ghetto, building in the multiplier factors that will open up ever-widening economic opportunities.

Sixth, a strategy for a New America requires a drastic revision of the priorities reflected in the present federal budget. Out of \$136 billion which the federal government plans to spend this year, more must be found for the needs I have been discussing.

If the lot of millions of people on earth is more important than putting a man on the moon in this decade, let us invest more in people and even less in space. Let us spend more in Harlem and less in the Sea of Tranquility. If it is more important to provide decent homes than to subsidize candidates seeking national office in 1968, let us provide tax credits for those who are providing housing rather than those who are making political contributions.

We can cut down and defer public works (for which the President has budgeted almost \$10 billion); we can wait to beautify our highways; we can delay urban renewal projects that replace potentially serviceable housing with palatial office buildings and luxury apartments; we can slow down spending for a multitude of other purposes, even some defense spending—but we can't hold back on eradicating slums and on the promise of a better life for those who live in them.

Finally, a strategy for a New America re-

quires personal involvement, personal commitment, and dedicated leadership.

Behind every creative, innovative, working program that I found across the nation, there is a creative, innovative, working, dedicated leader.

Some leaders are professionals, some volunteers. Some are white, some black. Some are wealthy, some poor.

But they all believe in the people they are trying to help. They all have the ability to inspire others to give of themselves in a team effort. And they all recognize the urgent need to draw on every resource they can muster.

Their programs are impressive and successful, but they are still only small, isolated examples of what people can do. We must find more effective ways to transfer experience from one city to another. Successful efforts must be quickly multiplied a thousand fold—and this requires that leadership be multiplied a thousand fold.

The great political temptation will be to institutionalize and federalize these programs, on the theory that only the vast resources of government can do the job. But that would be a tragic error. Not even government's resources are adequate to more than scratch the surface of the job that must be done.

Of course, national leadership and national resources are essential. But no single master plan can meet our needs. In order to achieve a total answer, we must have a thousand different answers.

Any approach which fails to recognize the importance of local diversity and leadership, personal involvement, private action, and self-help will smother the sparks of progress I have seen.

We cannot hire a federal good samaritan to substitute for our individual citizen involvement in solving the problems of the ghetto.

Government's greatest role should be as stimulator, clearinghouse, and catalyst in helping to release the energies of the private, independent and voluntary sectors of the American community.

We need dedicated national leadership which will identify, stimulate, and encourage the spread of proven and effective projects. We need leadership which understands the relative roles of the several levels of government and private activity.

One Negro leader said to me two weeks ago, "America must face up to the fact that it's a massive job, and there's no more important problem, and there's no more time."

We must arouse ourselves from our comfort, pleasures and preoccupations and listen to the voices from the ghettos.

We must help them help themselves so they, too, can be a part of the American dream.

Together, we can build a New America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous request, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WHITENER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr.

AREND), for 30 minutes, on October 11, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CORMAN (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), on October 12 for 20 minutes; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. AREND) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. PHILBIN.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2388. An act to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 985. An act for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 10, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1145. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request that certain wilderness areas in California, Oregon, and Wyoming be included in the national wilderness preservation system (H. Doc. No. 173); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1146. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract to continue to provide accommodations, facilities, and services in Crater Lake National Park, Oreg., pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1147. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952,

as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1148. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-175; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1149. A letter from the Secretary, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to correct and improve the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1150. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 7, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Kawkaulin River, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 15, 1947; no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been approved by the Chief of Engineers for accomplishment under section 205 of the 1948 Flood Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of October 5, 1967, the following bills were reported on October 6, 1967:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12066. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10213. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1125) (Rept. No. 737). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11131. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America (Rept. No. 738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9059. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations (Rept. No. 739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11395. A bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 authorizing the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960; with amendment (Rept. No. 740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6527. A bill to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property; with amendment (Rept. No. 741). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11638. A bill to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 742). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13094. A bill to amend the Commodity

Exchange Act, as amended (Rept. No. 743). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted October 9, 1967]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 13048. A bill to make certain technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act (Rept. No. 744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 13178. A bill to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within the U.S. Capitol Buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 745). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 746). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXIV, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13357. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 13358. A bill to provide to every American a full opportunity to have adequate employment, housing, and education, free of any discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 13359. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13360. A bill to study the advisability of establishing an International Development Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 13361. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 13362. A bill to provide certain essential assistance to the U.S. fisheries industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 13363. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 13364. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 13365. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

H.R. 13366. A bill to exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from the requirements of certain laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 13367. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13368. A bill to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RABICK, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 13369. A bill to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 13370. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain adjustments in lands or interests therein acquired in connection with the Navarro Mills Reservoir, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13371. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities, to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States, to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities, and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 13372. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.J. Res. 877. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 878. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Con. Res. 521. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro-Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H. Con. Res. 522. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro-Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 13373. A bill for the relief of Rich-

and C. Mockler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 13374. A bill for the relief of Sfc. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13375. A bill for the relief of Christopher John Kyriazis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 13376. A bill for the relief of Fong Shu Shee, Fong Toy Hing, Fong Ng Shee, Fong Mee Yew, and Fong Buck Hoi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 13377. A bill for the relief of Zacarias Quitoriano Montero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13378. A bill for the relief of Expedito Soriano Angco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13379. A bill for the relief of Demetrio Tabalon Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 13380. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arturo Brito Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13381. A bill for the relief of Dr. Victor Luis Bienes Jimenez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13382. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando De Varona De Zayas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13383. A bill for the relief of Marcelino Suarez Pedemonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13384. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angel Rafael Marino Varona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13385. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nis Juarez Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13386. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario A. Garcia Gamboa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 13387. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Epifanio Morera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

170. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to NASA appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

171. Also, petition of the city of Brentwood, Calif., relative to tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

172. Also, petition of city of Oroville, Calif., relative to tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

173. Also, petition of city of Brea, Calif., relative to Government tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1967

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O Thou God of love and hope, through all the length of changing years Thy goodness falleth never.

In a day so full of fear and threat, save

CXIII—1777—Part 21

us from any panic of spirit, because our inner strength is drawn from deep wells.

With the light of Thy wisdom and strength of Thy grace, enable those who in these baffling times have been entrusted with the stewardship of the national concern, to be true servants of Thine in the welfare of Thy kingdom's cause.

Help us to remember that we are Thy children and belong to Thee, who hast set a restlessness in our hearts, and made us all seekers after that which we can never fully find.

Deliver us from all malice and contempt lest we hurt others and sour our own souls.

Hear Thou our prayer as out of the depths we cry, asking for wisdom and strength as we bow at the altar stairs which slope through darkness up to Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 6, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] there be a time limitation of 3 minutes on statements with relation to routine morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees, except the Committee on Finance, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing the floor?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be not charged to the time allotted to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spong in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, for the past several weeks, several Senators from both parties have commented, in major speeches, on the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. Some of their speeches represented a distinct change of opinion and contained rather severe criticism of the conduct of the war.

Since I am frequently asked what this means for the Republican Party and what my own personal opinion is, I wish today clearly to define my personal stand.

I do not believe that the individual view of any of us who are members of the Republican Party can validly be interpreted as an expression of party position any more than the variant views within the President's own ranks represent Democratic policy. I wish the Republican Party were solidly united on the issue of Vietnam, but I do not think it vitally significant that it is not. There is room for honest dissent and full respect for the opinions of others.

I say this because I want it clearly understood at the outset of my remarks that I am not trying to start an argument with or to denigrate the views of other members of my party. Nor am I attempting, at this time, to predict what the Republican Party, assembled at its national convention in Miami next year, will decide in presenting its foreign policy positions on Vietnam and Asia generally; nor, for that matter, what the Democratic Party, assembled at its national convention in Chicago next year, may decide with regard to its foreign policy positions.

I can say only where this Senator stands.

I wish first to speak in behalf of the Office of the President of the United States because its present occupant has, on the subject of Vietnam, been the target of a torrent of criticism—some of it proper, and some of it, in my view, beneath the dignity of his office.

My deepest concern, as I look at the position of my country in world affairs, is with the integrity and prestige of the Presidency. I believe it is imperative that we do not undermine the stature of the President as Commander in Chief and as the Nation's chief diplomat.

As a legislator, I, of course, would not downgrade the role of Congress in the formulation of our foreign policy. As a Senator, I share the jealousy of all my colleagues in the Senate's right to advise and consent. The President is, however, as John Marshall said in 1799, "the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations." In the eyes of the world from beyond our borders, it is the President who is the focal point when America is the subject of attention. Loyal American support of Presidential action in resisting aggression must not be misunderstood or underestimated by friend or foe. Our resolution in support of our policies, if received with skepticism abroad, can